

expt.

~~C/L~~
(C/L 20 3)



STARR KING SCHOOL
FOR THE MINISTRY
2441 LE CONTE AVENUE
BERKELEY, CALIF. 94709

Alanson Titcher
Book

Presented by his Friend
Jacob Inge

Richard Eddy

Presented by Alanson Peterson


THE


Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."


BY THE

EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK.

——
EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

——
VOL. IV.

FROM MAY 1823, TO MAY 1824, INCLUSIVE.

——

"The Lord is my light and my salvation; who shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" Psa. xxvii. 1.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD,
NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

.....
1824.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.



A

<i>Agents</i> for the Gospel Herald	- - -	8
<i>Adams</i> , President, letter to Dr. Bancroft	- - -	16
<i>Anecdotes</i>	48, 231, 232, 240,	352
<i>Appeal</i> to candid professors	- - -	202
<i>Almanac</i> , Account of an	- - -	214
<i>Alex</i> , Synod of	- - -	240
<i>Advice</i> , how to manage &c.	- - -	332, 403
<i>Atonement</i> , View of, by Professor M.	- - -	352

B

<i>Bible Society</i> , American, statement relative to	23
Life members of, how made	43
<i>Boswell</i> , Wm. Account of the conversion of	57
Articles of faith of	31
BIOGRAPHY, &c.	
<i>Life</i> , Sketch of the, of P. Hamilton	79
E. Winchester	335
Dr. Chauncy	354, 364, 372
<i>Bigotry</i> , Instance of	33, 224
<i>Bethel Flag</i>	101
<i>Bible</i> , Account of the	149, 155
<i>Brownley Mr.</i> Account of the preaching of	167
<i>Baptism</i> , Remarks on	239, 350
<i>Book of life</i> , Remarks on the	283
<i>Balfour's Inquiry</i> , Account of	349, 353
<i>Belsham</i> , Thomas (of London) Account of the works of	385

C

Church, Soldier in the	-	-	-	32
New	-	-	-	32, 200
Conversions in the Ministry	40,	86,	96,	125, 336
Hopeful	-	-	-	231
Clergymen, Account of two honourable	-	-	-	43
New calling for	-	-	-	201
Contradictions	-	-	-	56
Cumming, Dr. Account of his Sermon	64,	129		
Prayer of	-	-	-	112
Politeness of	-	-	-	113
Corner stone, laying of a	-	-	-	79
Calvinism vs. New-Jerusalemism	-	-	-	84
vs. Universalism	-	-	-	131
Naked	-	-	-	337
Christianity, Corruptions of	-	-	-	83
Description of	-	-	-	363
Costly Churches	-	-	-	102
Cox, Mr. the clergyman, Account of, &c.	-	-	-	108
Clarke's Commentary, Concession in	-	-	-	134
Remarks on	-	-	-	143
Cudstorf, Mr. Letter from, &c.	-	-	-	166
Calvinists' Articles	-	-	-	200
Churches, Increase of	-	-	-	256
Christian spirit considered	-	-	-	272
Friends, Society of, their liberality to other denominations	-	-	-	328
Cain's wife, where from	-	-	-	303
Christ, Character of, considered	-	-	-	310
Coercion considered	-	-	-	317
Calvin, John, Melancholy news from	-	-	-	319
Creed of	-	-	-	395
Cause and effect illustrated	-	-	-	325
Crusades, Brief account of the	-	-	-	340
Calvinistic doctrines supplanted	-	-	-	367

<i>Calvinistic absurdities</i>	- - -	402
<i>1 Cor. xi. 23, 29.</i> Remarks on	- - -	374
<i>Catholic</i> , Hint to a	- - -	384
<i>Col. ii. 6.</i> Remarks on	- - -	389
<i>Child</i> , Acuteness of a	- - -	396

D

<i>Dream</i> of Clergymen	- - -	20
<i>Dedication</i> of Churches	- - -	23, 200, 216
<i>Death bed</i> , Universalism on a	- - -	29
<i>Damnation</i> , Resurrection of	- - -	34
<i>Darkness</i> , Works of	- - -	30, 193
<i>Demonology</i> , Discourse on	- - -	39
Remarks on	117, 246, 269,	286
<i>McDowell</i> , Wm. A. Letters to	- - -	97
<i>Devils' doctrine</i>	- - -	116
Personality of,	- - -	119
Children	- - -	151
<i>Devil?</i> What is the	216, 286, 295,	303
Queries respecting the	- - -	383
<i>Dewitt</i> , Mr. Some account of	- - -	123
<i>Deut. xxxii. 12.</i> Remarks on	- - -	136
<i>Deity</i> , Attributes of	- - -	193
<i>Diet</i> , New article of	- - -	206
<i>Destruction</i> of enemies	- - -	232
<i>Dialogue</i> between a Calvinist and Universalist	- - -	333, 363
<i>Death</i> , Sin unto	- - -	366

E

<i>Excommunication</i> of Mrs. M. T.	- - -	6, 7, 30
H. H. Winchester	- - -	9, 25
a Boy	- - -	152
Mrs. Horton	- - -	161
Wm. White	- - -	177
Mrs. Mathewson	- - -	345
<i>Eternal misery</i> , Saurin's view of	- - -	40
Thoughts of	- - -	131
<i>Elwell</i> , Mr. E. Trial of	- - -	58, 75
Remarks on, &c.	- - -	83
<i>Extravagance</i> , Remarks on	- - -	140
<i>Earth</i> , Co-operation of the, in producing vegetables	- - -	213
<i>Exhortation</i> , A word of,	- - -	247
<i>Evangelizing</i> , A new way of	- - -	327
<i>Education</i> , Force of	- - -	336

F

<i>Free agency</i> considered	- - -	2, 11, 19
<i>Fanaticism</i>	- - -	24
<i>Friends</i> , Complaint of one of the	- - -	47
<i>Friday breakers</i> , Warning to	- - -	30
<i>Fraud</i> , A stupendous	- - -	143
<i>Fuller's Tract</i> , Remarks on	- - -	145
<i>Faith</i> , Confession of, Remarks on	- - -	139
Christian, confession of, at Constantinople	- - -	407
<i>Fashion</i> , Court of	- - -	240
<i>Future punishment</i> , A discourse upon the duration of,	249, 262, 265, 273, 281, 289,	297
<i>False brethren</i>	- - -	313

G

<i>Great beast</i> , voice of the	- - -	33
-----------------------------------	-------	----

INDEX

<i>Gospel</i> , Another	47
<i>God</i> , Reconciliation to	60
Mother of	191
<i>Goats</i> , Milking of the	64
<i>German Lutheran Church</i> , Trouble in the	101
<i>Greek criticisms</i>	165, 168, 274, 281, 342
<i>Grace</i> , Nature of saving	208
<i>God's mercy</i> , A Calvinist's opinion of	294
<i>Good men</i> , Salvation of	390
<i>Government of God</i>	403

H

<i>Hint</i> , A Scriptural	49
<i>Hypocrisy</i> exposed	53
<i>Human understanding</i> , Locke on the	175
<i>Hymns</i> , Singing of, Remarks on	176
<i>Hell</i> , Redemption from	205
<i>Harlots</i> , Mother of	239
<i>Hades</i> , hell, or grave, Remarks on	279
<i>Hindoos</i> , Difficulty in evangelizing the	307
<i>Hopkinsian holiness</i> , Purity of	413

I

<i>Installations</i>	24, 64
<i>Indians and Missionaries</i>	51, 186, 352
<i>India</i> , Religious controversy in	55
<i>Inscription</i> in corner stone of New Church, &c.	79
<i>Intolerance</i>	232
<i>Isa. vii.</i> Supposed discrepancy in considered	334, 343, 351
<i>If</i> , use of an	352
<i>Interesting</i> , Something very	416

J

<i>Jews</i> , Attempts to convert the	24
<i>Judson</i> , Mrs. Account of	126, 182, 238
<i>Judgments</i> , Erroneous opinion of	197
<i>John vii. 37.</i> Sermon on	255
<i>Judas Iscariot</i> , Remarks on	235
Remarks on by Mr. M.	341
<i>James i. 14, 15.</i> Remarks on	309
<i>Joshua xxiv. 15.</i> Remarks on	348
<i>Judgment</i> , Christ's coming to, Sermon on	358, 361, 369, 379

K

<i>Knox</i> , John, Letter from, to the faithfull in Lundounne	172
--	-----

L

<i>Letter</i> from Br. Worrall	61
from Br. S. R. Smith	62
written during the advent of Christ	323
from a Calvinist to his Nephew	337, 393
<i>Luke xii. 16-20.</i> Remarks on	78
xiii. 23, Remarks on	129
xvi. 23, Remarks on	394
xii. 4, 5, Remarks on	401
<i>Liberality</i> considered	120
Exhortation to	328
<i>Lam. iv. 6.</i> Remarks on	144
<i>Lawyer</i> and witness	230
<i>Last state</i> considered	234
<i>Lavater's practical commentary</i>	382

M

<i>Mother</i> , The careful	21
<i>Matt. xiii. 47-50.</i> Remarks on	41
xxv. 46, Remarks on	167
xii. 43-45, Remarks on	234
xxv. 46, Remarks on	266
xiii. 36-43, Remarks on	329

<i>Money</i> , Efficacy of	47, 347
Love of, a baleful root	94
<i>Man and Reverend Doctor two</i>	38
an infinite being	327
<i>Ministers in demand</i>	93
Demand of	95
Motives to	331
<i>Missionaries</i> , Spinning wheel of	103
Ideas of	128
Blessed effects of	136
Remarks on	162
among the Indians	186
Power of	255
Modesty of	326
Prayer meetings of	347
Expedients of	399
<i>Melancholy events</i>	112, 232, 296, 336, 375
<i>Methodist Church</i> , Letters to members of	125, 132, 137, 215
<i>My people</i>	231
<i>Mark ix. 45.</i> Translation of, erroneous	276
<i>Mahometan creed</i>	351
<i>Mercy</i> , Offspring of	<i>ibid</i>
<i>Mortality</i> , Bill of	352
<i>Micah vi. 3.</i> Remarks on	391

N

<i>New Heaven and Earth</i> , Remarks on the	28
<i>Newark</i> , Account of preaching at	52, 94, 103, 130, 160, 174
<i>Natural man</i> ,	49, 77, 82
<i>New-Jerusalem Missionary</i>	109, 157, 163, 169, 206, 209, 218, 225, 241, 257, 514, 323, 377
<i>News</i>	176
from a far country	<i>ibid</i>
<i>Notices</i> , Various	304, 336
<i>New-Orleans</i> , Letter from	333
<i>New-York</i> , Pauperism in	335
<i>Nice distinction</i>	376
<i>Num. xvi. 27-33.</i> Remarks on	381

O

<i>Obituary notices</i>	33, 236, 238, 303
<i>Ohio</i> , News from	192
<i>Opposition</i> to the truth	247
<i>Orthodox errors</i>	272
Slander	303, 416
<i>Objections to Universalism</i> considered	305

P

<i>Proverbs xi. 31.</i> Sermon on	3
<i>Paterson</i> , Preaching at	33
<i>Parable of the Net</i>	41
of the Ground, &c.	78
of the Wheat and Tares	329
<i>Punishment</i> , Remarks on	41
Aionion considered	275
<i>Paul</i> , Something of	46
<i>Pharisees</i> , &c.	30
<i>Prayers</i> , Long, impropriety of	117
Noisy	56
New subject of	120
Inefficacy of formal	384
<i>1 Peter iii. 13-20.</i> Remarks on	121
<i>Presbyterian</i> , A lady's complaint of a	143
<i>Pagan doctrine</i> exploded	237
<i>Purification</i> considered	244
<i>Petipierre</i> , Extract from	320
<i>Preachers</i> , A hint to young	342
<i>Pulpit declamation</i>	344
<i>Passover</i> considered	350
<i>Public teaching</i> , Remarks on	375
<i>Preaching</i> , Visionary	376
A clergyman's opinion of	390

INDEX.

Price's Sermons, Extract from	383, 390
Prospectus	392
Psa. xl. 9, 10. Remarks on	400

Q

Queries, Important	144, 175, 237
proposed and answered by Univer-	
salists and Calvinists	236
Question, An important	399

R

Revelation xx. 10, Sermon on	13, 17
Repentance, A new way to excite	40
Rammohun Roy, Account of	42
Religious stock jobbers	63
world, Remarks on	261
freedom	412
REVIEW of Dr. Cumming's Sermon	65
of Dr. Spring's Appeal	105
of Mr. Ruffner's Discourse	243, 250
262, 266, 275, 282, 290, 297	
Religion exemplified	36
Roman Catholic outwitted	126, 135
Reason asked, &c.	144
Regeneration, Definition of	165, 244
Rain, Prayer for	176
Resurrection of Christ	206
Revival, Account of a	248
A wonderful	309
Blessings of a	416
Rahway (N. J.) News from	323
Redemption considered	333
Rochester, Formation of a Society in	334
Red Jacket's reply to a Missionary	386
Rom. ix. 3. Remarks on	389

S

Sermon, A Funeral	35
A counterfeit	193
Souls, Duty of caring for	72
Spring, Dr. Respectful notice of	80
Defence of	113, 130, 141
Sabbath breakers, Warning to	80
Salvation considered	37
Sabbath day, Remarks on the	111
Spirits in prison	121
Soldier and Virgin Mary	135
Stupendous fraud	143
Sodom, Punishment of	144
Scriptures, Difficulties which attend the study	
of the	147, 153, 171 179, 185
Genuineness of the	155
Sin, Infinity of	152
Story, An orthodox	192
Seven spirits	235
Scotland, News from	264
Southold, Letter from	295, 321
Salary officers	319
Saybrook Platform	357
Swearing	376
Seneca Mission	386
Sacrifices, Pathetic description of	416

T

Titles, Clerical	44, 320
Apology for	360
Considered	396
Thoughts	46
Truth, Triumph of	58, 75
Trinity, Doctrine of the	76, 202, 215, 230, 411
Sermon on	404, 409
Episcopalian views of the	412
Tempest, A violent	93
Tithes	120
1 Thessalonians v. 9, Remarks on	129
Terrible, A touch of the	192
Temptation considered	309
Trinitarians, Questions to	376, 406
Reply to	395, 414
Toleration considered	333

U

Universalism, Licentious tendency of, proved	48
Effects of	122, 124
the cause of drunkenness,	131
Progress of,	173, 181
Strictures on	217
renounced, 299, 301, 312, 313, 319	
Unitarian controversy, Facts relating to	127
Uniturians in England, Universalists	201
Appeal of	202
Unpardonable sin considered	284
Universalist clergymen once believers in end-	
less misery	302
The term considered	319

UNIVERSALISTS' ASSOCIATIONS.

Southern—Circular of	73, 313
Western	91, 256
General Convention	96, 144, 183
General Epistle of the	233
Black River	256

V

Vade-Mecum, Hint to author of the	43
Virtue, Nature of	127
Voltaire, Declaration of	191

W

Women, Silly	40, 43
Wesley, (J.) Some opinions of	108
World, Love of the	128
The, by Massillon	403
Warning, An awful	136, 319
Winchester, (Elhanan,) Character of	335
War, Holy	408

Y

Young preachers, A hint to	342
----------------------------	-----

Z

Zeal of sectarians	134
--------------------	-----

INDEX.

POETRY.

Infancy and mature age	16	Invitation	192
Stanzas	24	Siste Viator	208
Boast not, &c.	32	The Pilgrim	232
Certainty of Death	40	The Resurrection	240
Laying of Corner Stone	68	Gospel Melodies	256
A Poem	96	Human Folly	272
Kindred in Hell	112	Carrier's Address	280
Epitaph, &c.	128	Christmas Hymn	288
Thoughts on the Equinox	176	Hymn	360
Good Samaritan	184	Lines by an Idiot	384

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK, EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1823.

NO. I.

PROSPECTUS

OR

CONSTITUTION

OF THIS PAPER.

The present may with propriety be termed an era of Liberal Investigation. The iron hand of civil despotism is palsied beneath the touch of reason; ecclesiastical tyranny and oppression are fading, like the mists of the morning, before the steady, scrutinizing, and triumphant march of TRUTH. TRUTH, a Divine effulgence from the God of Nature, of Reason, and of Love, has pierced the gloom which centuries have witnessed, fostered by every degrading and repugnant principle abhorrent to humanity, and, pointing a celestial index, invites man to more genial climes—a brighter sun, and kindlier heavens. In the impressive language of Inspiration, "*Life and Immortality* are brought to light by the GOSPEL." The revelation of the Word and Will of God, the common Father, taking "the wings of the morning, is visiting the remotest corners of the earth." Instead of slumbering in the cell of the ascetic, fettered with monkish legends, and the dreams of fanatics, the Scriptures, stripped of the illegitimate apportionments of men, are dazzling with all their lustre, and shining into the once benighted minds of rejoicing thousands. The *fagot* has ceased to blaze. The *embers* are cold; warmed only with the frozen relics which moulder in the bosoms of superstition's ghastly train. Bursting upon the world, after the slumber of ages, the NEWS, or, "*good tidings of great joy*," is heard, for "you, and all mankind." God has unlocked futurity to man. The destinies of a world are proclaimed; and the Father, Friend, and Saviour of mankind, viewed through the medium of his own communications, is seen, the unchangeable Benefactor and Lover of the souls that he hath made.

Involved with these considerations, are questions, momentous in their nature, universal in their application, and glorious in their import. The character and purposes of God, the origin and destination of man, in the aggregate, furnish sublime contemplation to him, who, reading with unclouded eyes the Testament of his heavenly Father, finds God his Friend, mankind his brethren, and heaven his home! In exchange for the husks of a mongrel theology, the fruit of darkness, gendered in the seclusion of bigoted error, accept the viands of Heaven, and feast at the banquet of TRUTH! Reason, ever attendant, waits, the cheerful assistant, at the repast. And a joy, more delicious than the fabled nectar of the

gods, will succeed, with fruits, which will flourish in never-ending bloom.

In accordance with the foregoing sentiments, PROPOSALS for publishing the *Fourth Volume* of the GOSPEL HERALD are now offered to the Public. Its columns are open to the world. No conditions incompatible with reason will be required, even of our bitterest opponents in principle, and those, who in sentiment are our foes. Sound reasoning, and strong arguments, will always have a decided preference in our columns, particularly when *opposed* to the Editor's sentiments and those of his contemporaries; with the only condition of decency in expression, and a prolixity compatible with the size of this work.

Truth is the object; reason, the means to obtain it; and the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the source from which alone it is to be obtained. Impartial discussion, not dogmatical opinions, sanctioned only by tradition and the *ipse dixit* of fallible men, will refute error and elicit truth. Friends and opponents, in religious sentiments, therefore, are invited to patronize this Paper, by giving their aid in subscriptions, and enriching its columns with mental support.

To those who fear the prevalence of the doctrines we advocate, our motto says, "FEAR NOT; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to ALL people!" To those who would oppose the stale objection of the licentious tendency of the faith we confess, an apostle says, "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared, *teaching us*, that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

CONDITIONS.

This Work will be of the *Super-Royal Octavo* size; each Number containing *eight pages*, of two columns each; on fine Super-Royal paper, at two DOLLARS per year, payable in *advance*.

It will be published every Saturday, devoted to theological discussion and inquiry, without regard to name, sect, or party.

This Paper will be printed on a *Bourgeois* type, of which this is a sample, and make a Super-Royal Octavo volume of 420 pages annually, including an Index to the contents, which will be delivered to Subscribers at the close of the year, to complete the volume.

No Subscription for a less term than one year, (which includes one whole volume,) will be received. *New-York, May 10, 1823.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

DEAR SIR,—Your promptitude in noticing my former communication, encourages me with a hope that the present will not be deemed an intrusion, when I assure you, that my addressing you again, is not from arrogating to myself that I am theologian sufficient to confute your tenets; neither do I enter the field of controversy for the sake of argument, but merely from a desire of gaining satisfactory information on so important a question as the *final* happiness or misery of man. And as I cannot perceive your remarks to bear any analogy to my former request, I will, (with deference,) offer my opinion, by way of replication. At present I belong to no sect, but I duly consider the import of Paul's warning, Col. ii. 8, which makes me very tenacious about pinning my faith on any man's sleeve, without his doctrine is both cogent and convincing.

You say, "No man is *free* to sin, because he is *forbidden* to sin." This, (with due deference,) I hold to be a contradiction in terms; for man certainly does commit sin. Now, if it is not of his own free will, of whose will is it that he does sin? Surely you won't say it is God's will. If God's will, where is the necessity of any injunction? *What!* God forbid a man to do that which is according to the counsel of his own will! In my opinion, that would be no great proof of infinite wisdom. Why are we bid to choose good in preference to evil, in order that we might live? Is it not on the supposition that we have the power of choosing? It would be preposterous to tell a man to do a thing (knowing at the same time,) that it was impossible for him to do. If preposterous in man, how much more so in a Being possessing infinite wisdom?

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

OF T. G.'s first paragraph, we shall say no more than that we pass it by as an exordium.

T. G.'s second paragraph is a definition, we presume, of the phrase "contradiction in terms." Quere. Is a man *free* (i. e. at *liberty*) to do that which God has forbidden? Our correspondent will have the condescension to grant us the privilege of judging and deciding, that freedom without *liberty*, is no freedom at all. Let it be understood, that the quibbling evasions and childish opinions of modern pretenders to orthodoxy, form no part of our creed, and have no weight in influencing our decisions. We use words according to their obvious and necessary import, and shall consider our correspondents accountable for the terms and phrases they introduce, any notions they may possess to the contrary notwithstanding.* Therefore, if it is a "contradiction in terms," to say that no man is *free* to do that which God has *forbidden*, then congruity consists in saying, that man is *not free* to do that which God

commands! Here are premises and conclusions for the consideration of T. G.'s leisure.

Not being willing that ourselves or others should crowd the columns of this Paper with superfluous and unprofitable matter, we purpose to bring this discussion to a speedy close, by giving it a shape which shall be too prominent and visible in its features to be easily mistaken. We therefore ask,

What is *free agency*? From whence came it? What was intended to be accomplished by it?

The first question is invariably answered thus—Free agency is a *power* to choose and refuse. The second thus—God invested man with free agency, thereby constituting him a free agent. Now the third question *must* be answered, What was God's design in furnishing man with this power? Or, what did God design to *accomplish* by this free agency? Evasion and sophistry cannot effect an escape from the conclusion, that if God designed any thing, the thing designed *must* be attained or accomplished, or God's design is frustrated; which militates against his power, or wisdom, or both. Revelation and reason will not, cannot admit this. If God designed that man's power of free agency should eventuate in his *salvation*, then, man will as certainly be saved as he is a free agent. If God designed that man's free agency should result in his *damnation* and destruction, then man will as certainly be damned as he is a free agent. If God never designed *any thing*, when he constituted man a free agent, then *nothing* will ever be accomplished by man's free agency, in conformity to the will or design of God. Now we are assured, that it "is God's will that all men shall be *saved*." Therefore, it must be conceded, that God never gave man any *power*, (call it free agency, or whatever you please,) which could possibly prevent the accomplishment of his purposes. We, therefore, contend, that, if God designed to accomplish any thing by man's free agency, what God designed *must* be accomplished. And if God never designed to accomplish *any thing* by man's free agency, then contingency, or, if you please, the *chance* of the Atheist, will alone determine the final condition of all God's rational creation. To our correspondent, and to all men, we say, Here are the premises and conclusions. If you enter the lists in favour of your free agency, the *weapons* are spread before you. You have no escape. Their points are dipped in *TRUTH*, and will pierce your errors and sever your sophistry in a moment!

The character of God, as a *wise* and *good* Being, is irreconcilable with this modern hypothesis of free agency. For a *wise* Being would never leave the all-important concern of the *endless* well-being of myriads of his beloved and susceptible offspring, to the sport and uncertainty of *chance*! *Wisdom* would *foresee* the evil, and provide a remedy. A *good* Being would never place in *jeopardy* the objects of his *love*, and, unconcerned, permit them to be destroyed with *endless* wretchedness, from any cause, or by any power. *Reason*, which is Truth and Heavenly illumination, will for ever be at war with such horrible conclusions. Conclusions, which

* Quere. What became of Paul's free agency, when he was going to Damascus, and was arrested in his mad career, by the omnipotence of Jehovah? We consider this to be a sweeping objection to this absurd hypothesis. Convince a blind man that he is a free agent, and can choose or refuse the best and safest path, and his folly will cause him to reject the guidance of a helper, and precipitate him to destruction.

rob God of every attribute which can exalt his character above the devil. O HORRIBLE! O MOST HORRIBLE!

But there is another, and not the least, objection to this impious and absurd doctrine. Agency, without ability, is like a deadly weapon in the hands of a madman. Is man a free agent? What is to be the consequence of his use and abuse of this power?

Ans. ENDLESS, INTERMINABLE felicity, or *wo indescribable!* Reader, stand you aghast! Let your face be livid!—Your knees smite each other, while your trembling frame shudders with horror inexpressible! What are you about? Know thou, that the Author of your being is unaffected and unconcerned with your fate; and left you to soar in a Heaven of your own procuring, or sink in never-ending wretchedness, the fruit of your own folly and imbecility, and will never extend the helping hand, to rescue you from the tremendous fate which awaits you! Do you believe this? (We speak plain, for the occasion demands it.) Answer you, Yes. 'Tis false. The horrible conviction of such a terrible reality, would drive you to madness, suicide and death. Let the fate of thousands, who have arrived to the faith of the accursed conclusion, that God had left them a prey to misery and wo, attest the truth of our declaration. Men will not reason—and without reasoning they can never arrive at just conclusions. See your free agent, an arrant knave or fool! Why are his powers dormant? Where are his boasted faculties? Why is he blinded, in the midst of his illuminations, to the realities which surround him, to the tremendous convictions which his powers should awaken? A heaven of peace, and a hell of horror, passes in review before him, and he, unconcerned, busies himself about the straws and wind; or the passing ribbons and equipage of his brother fools! Surely, this would be slander if it were not truth, that man, with all his boasted powers and faculties, is a fool! But he is a free agent! And what is a *free agent*? A creature blind to his own interest. Unconcerned, when a hell of interminable wretchedness is the forfeit of his misusing his wonderful wisdom and powers, and a heaven of rapturous felicity is offered as the reward of his exertions. But all this cannot move him.—His free agency is stagnant.—It is a property which the divine chymists of the day cannot analyze. What is it? O! It is *free agency*.

We are not trifling with a momentous subject. We are only "shooting folly as it flies." Reader, is this free agent *qualified* to act? Pause—before you decide. Remember, he is a *fool*! He cannot be moved by all the hopes of heaven, nor by all the horrors of hell. He has no inducement, save the impulse which is given by his *free agency*. What is that? Why, nothing at all. He is stupid, while his days are numbering; and he meets his fate, without a summons, and receives, for pay, a heaven he could never contemplate, or a hell, the miseries of which his mind could never understand. His whole conduct, on the very face of it, is like the child, who prefers copper coin to silver, giving a preference to *quantity* over *quality*. And all this, for

the cogent reason, that the free agent is a *fool*. Wisdom would never conduct in this manner. No! Your free agent is trading with a *capital*, and altogether ignorant of its *amount*. Dealing in *goods*, without knowing any thing of their real *value*. A mere *idiot*! The sticklers for free agency must bear all this, and comfort themselves with reflections of their wisdom and greatness. We conclude this paragraph, by saying, "Facts are stubborn things."

To T. G.'s interrogations we reply—God has declared "that which is *good*." But man, blinded through the deceitfulness of *sin*, (i. e. listening to his own desires and wishes, his *free agency*, if you please,) is not disposed to believe God, but would rather trust to himself, and gather inspiration from his fellows. *Liberty* is power. Knowledge is power. An *ignorant* man is a slave, and is weak. Liberty, without power, is impossible. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, (*love*), there is *liberty*;" and there is no liberty from any other source. We repeat our oft made declaration—The offices of Christ are, "to *open* the *blind eyes*, to bring the prisoner *out* of the prison," &c. T. G.'s *free agent* is *blind*, and in *prison*. A wretched freedom, or liberty, this! God's declaration is, "*I will* be their God, and *they shall* be my people." A declaration, of all others, the farthest removed from the modern hypothesis of free agency.

(To be continued.)

Note.—Our correspondent, we trust, will not be offended with the liberty we have taken in adapting our phraseology to suit, what we consider, a very absurd doctrine. We consider the principles we combat distinct from T. G., they being a generally received hypothesis by all Aiminians, who rob God of his omnipotence and wisdom, and transfer them, by stealth, to the creature, who is injured, instead of being benefited, by the illegitimate acquisition.

SERMON,

Delivered in the Duane-street Church, on Sabbath evening, May 4, by WILLIAM HAGADORN.

Published by request of the Standing Committee.

PROVERBS XI. 31.

"Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner."

It is a sentiment that has obtained a very extensive sanction in the Christian world, that in *this life*, the righteous are miserable, and the wicked happy; and it is a sentiment as fraught with insincerity as it is opposed to the plainest testimonies of sacred writ, and contrary to the every day experience of its most confident professors. The insincerity of this hypothesis appears evident in the fact, that those who profess it, will not consider it as applicable to themselves. They will tell you, that it is a pity *good* people are so unprosperous in their circumstances, and so unhappy in their social and private relations; while the wicked triumph in all their wickedness, and riot in the enjoyment of their unmerited fortune. "It is a pity," say they, "that the righteous are so borne down by affliction, while the wicked are basking in the sunshine of Providential

favour, and enjoying all the felicity of contentment and cheerfulness."

This, my friends, would indeed be a pity if it were true; and they who declare it to be true, make use of this mistaken theory to disprove our text, and to establish the very reverse of its meaning. They will tell you, that this their favorite theory is a mystery in their minds: for, say they, "it is not so with ourselves. We are always blest in *our* righteousness; not, perhaps, *adequately*, for we expect a *full* recompense hereafter; but we do experience that 'wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.' Our *personal* experience teaches us, that 'the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open to their cry:' and, in relation to ourselves, *we feel*, that 'the way of the transgressor is hard,' and that 'the face of the Lord is against them that do evil;' *we feel* the truth of these divine testimonies as they relate to ourselves, but we cannot see their adaptation to the rest of mankind. For," say they, "we see the best professing christians, the strictest attendants on church worship, the conspicuous patrons of religious societies, and the most rigid discouragers of vice and immorality, having their visages furrowed and lengthened by habitual concern for their fellow men; and exhibiting, in their manner and conversation, all that gloominess and mortification of spirit, which is the concomitant of mental wo. These must therefore be unhappy, notwithstanding their great sanctity of character."

All this, my friends, may be strictly true. Professing christians, whose christianity is merely professional; who have the form, but practically deny the power of godliness; regular attendants on church worship, who, while attending to secular duties, have not God in all their thoughts; conspicuous patrons of religious societies, who labour more to propagate their sectarian dogmas, than the knowledge of God our Saviour; discouragers of vice and immorality, who are extremely solicitous to "pluck the mote from their brother's eye," while they are miserably blinded by "the beam in their own eye;"—these may, indeed, exhibit in their manner and conversation, all that gloominess and mortification of soul, which is the concomitant of mental wo. Their countenances may indeed be furrowed and elongated by habitual concern for their fellow men; while they are at rest, as it regards themselves, confiding in the hope of a salvation which their own righteousness is to accomplish. It may all be true, as it regards those who expect to take heaven by storm; who believe themselves capable, by dint of their own holiness, to gain the great reward of eternal joy. And it is equally true, that those who are esteemed by the religious world, as the wicked, and who are represented as in the enjoyment of that "*contentment and cheerfulness*" so much to be desired, may possess many of those virtues of which their happiness constitutes the recompense. The contentment and cheerfulness which they are said to possess, are virtues which it is our happiness as well as our duty to cherish. And when we find them in the possession of those whom we

superficially regard as strangers to every virtue, we often discover them to be the recompense of other virtues. They are modest virtues, which we are accustomed to overlook in the catalogue, because of their humble pretensions—because of that quality indeed, which properly forms their best commendation. They are at once virtues, and the recompense of virtues; for they are invariably the consequence of well-doing. We cannot recur to any kind or generous action we may have performed, and not feel both contented and cheerful in the contemplation. If we have rendered an essential service to one who is made happy and grateful by the benefit, we cannot look upon the good we have done, and the happiness we have been instrumental in conferring, without feeling grateful to the Supreme Giver, for having given us the ability and disposition to do good; and happiness, which is but the unit of contentment and cheerfulness, will be our sure recompense.

It is therefore true, that "the righteous are recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner:" and though the reverse of this divine declaration is insisted on; yet, when we consider that all which can be urged against it, arises in the misconception of those characters which are respectively spoken of, we cannot, independent of its sacred authority, refuse it our unqualified assent.

I have already said, and now repeat, that the opponents of the fact stated in our text, uniformly admit its truth in relation to *themselves*, while they deny its applicability to the rest of mankind. They confidently assert, that the wicked derive happiness from their wickedness, and that the righteous are the unhappy dupes of the artifice and cunning of the ungodly. They will not agree with the Psalmist, that "the wicked is snared in the work of *his own* hands; that *their* sword shall enter into *their own* heart, and their bows shall be broken: that a little that a righteous man hath is better than the riches of many wicked, for the arms of the wicked shall be broken, but the Lord upholdeth the righteous. That the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord, and he delighteth in his way, and though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." Nor will they agree with the Saviour, who says, of the wicked, "Verily, I say unto you, they *have* their reward." They cannot endure the declaration, although it was spoken by our Lord and Saviour, that the wicked *have* their reward. The tense is abhorrent to them; it forbids the presumption of that *future* endless retribution, which is proclaimed with so much eagerness and zeal, and of which the advocates are more tenacious than they are of the truth of God himself, who hath said, by his Spirit, that "Sorrow and sighing *shall* be done away, and there *shall be no more pain*." Yes, my friends, notwithstanding the suggestions of unbelief, be assured the time is coming, when, instead of the endless torment of souls, "God himself shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more pain." Then "all shall be taught of God;" then all his gracious purposes concerning man shall be unfolded, and then

shall every man acknowledge that our text has not a limited application; but that the righteous are indeed "recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." When this text shall be understood in its full latitude, there will be none to maintain the unscriptural doctrine of *future* rewards: for there is a perfect contradiction of meaning between present and future recompense, for good or evil deportment.

What, my friends, would we think of a magistrate, who, having recompensed an offender hand in hand with his offences, following up every crime with an adequate punishment; and, at last, when the old offender is no more capable of transgressing, by reason of his infirmities, seizes and sequestrates his defenceless patrimony, for those very crimes, for which the offender had already suffered, according to law? Would we say that this magistrate was discharging the duty of a just and upright judge? We certainly would not. The law had fixed the penalty for each offence, and these several penalties the culprit had suffered, immediately on becoming subject to them by his offences; yet the judge, by an extra-judicial exercise of power, follows with unrelenting severity to the grave, the superannuated offender, who had been a criminal in his youth, and had suffered, at the time, the lawful penalty of his guilt. How unjust would be the conduct of this magistrate! and how universally would his judgment be deprecated! O, then, let us not attribute such foul injustice to our God, under the mistaken idea that, because we call it justice as attributed to Him, it therefore is not injustice. God himself declares, Gen. i. that "man hath become like one of us, knowing good from evil." If, therefore, we know good from evil, such an act as would, in every age, by every people, be pronounced unrighteous in man, it must be impious to attribute to a righteous God. Injustice, call it by what name you please, is still injustice: and to attribute injustice to God, by whatever name we choose to call it, is most wicked. This is not the character of our God; it is not in this character that He is revealed to us, in the books of Moses and the prophets, or in the writings of the evangelists and apostles; nor is He thus "delineated in that stately volume, where every leaf is a spacious plain, every line a flowing brook, and every period a lofty mountain." No, my friends, the books, both of nature and revelation, exhibit the character of our God in a different light from this. Our Bible tells us, that "He is a just God and a Saviour;" and Nature teaches us, that he is our magnificent Patron, our every-day Benefactor. He will recompense the guilty *in the earth*; the scene of their wickedness shall be the scene of their suffering; and God will not, like an unrighteous judge, follow them beyond the grave, with that endless and unrelenting severity, with which, it is impiously said, in addition to their recompense in the *earth*, they shall be visited hereafter.

We are assured, that "the righteous shall be recompensed in the *earth*; much more the wicked and the sinner." And although this is the word of God, yet, because it is contrary to "the command-

ments of men," we hear it boldly asserted, that neither the righteous nor the wicked shall be recompensed in the earth, and that they both shall have their recompense in a *future* world. This sentiment is every day reiterated by those whose consciences and experience bear testimony of an opposite character. They will not say, that they, themselves, are not recompensed in the earth, for all the evil they commit. This would imply their liability to that future recompense, which they say the wicked shall suffer. But they will tell us, that they, themselves, are not adequately recompensed in the earth, for all their piety and virtue; but they expect a full recompense in the world to come. The truth is, that every such objector, however he may insist upon the unscriptural theory of infinite suffering for finite transgression, finds his own moral experience always opposed to him. Indeed, it is essential to our individual, and more especially to our social happiness; that dissipation and every kind of intemperance, as well as those vices for which the civil laws provide a punishment, should be the infallible precursors of retributive suffering. Were it not for the truly appalling consequences of dissipation, what numbers would have been carried away, in their youth, by those destructive allurements which intrude into every walk of life, and particularly beset the way of the young and the promising? How many, reclaimed from the seducements of those early propensities, which, if unrestrained, were calculated to ensure their destruction, are there now filling respectable places in society, and can look to the penal laws of their country, to its prisons, its pillories and its gibbets, and thank the terrors which they inspired for their moral salvation? There are numerous examples of this kind, practical witnesses to the fact, that the misery which follows as the sure consequence of crime, operates both as a terror to evil doers, and as a praise to those who do well. How then, can it be pretended, that the *wicked* are *happy*, when the mere apprehension of those consequences which follow in the train of transgression, produces this wonderful effect upon their conduct! When these consequences are so many moral restraints, operating upon the fears of the licentious, and, in many instances, reclaiming them from vice. No, my friends, the wicked are not happy. "They have their reward." They "are recompensed in the earth;" and their recompense is administered, by our Heavenly Father, for the wisest and most beneficent purposes, to his people.

It is a subject of triumph to all believers in *universal* benevolence, who live according to the precepts inculcated by this belief, that the opinion which stands in opposition to our text, is divided against itself, and, therefore, it cannot stand. It is an unscriptural theory, and expressive not only of extreme weakness, but also of extreme discontent under the providence of God. It is the common practice of the wicked, when suffering under the recompense of their guilt, to exclaim, "How unequal are the mercies of Providence bestowed! my neighbour, who is an infidel in doctrine, and a mere

moral man in practice, seems perfectly happy ; and I, notwithstanding my long prayers and my many observances, my *well known* charity, my mortifications, my vows, my hatred of Universal Salvation by the atonement, and my works in behalf of my own salvation ; notwithstanding all these, I am miserable !” Deluded man.—Are these the claims upon which thou dost risk the salvation of thy soul ? Hast thou no other foundation upon which to erect the hopes of thy salvation ? None ! Then art thou, indeed, miserable !—an unprofitable servant, groping thy precarious way in outer darkness, where thy weeping, thy wailing, and thy gnashing of teeth, may proclaim thy sorrow, but cannot alleviate the agony of thy soul. Alas ! poor soul, how art thou oppressed by the enemies of thy peace, warring continually against thee. But thou shalt be released from thy prison-house. Though thy foes are powerful, thy Friend, thy Creator, is almighty : and the time must come, when unbelief and self-sufficiency, and all the iniquitous bonds which now hold thee in subjection, shall be severed by the hand of death : thou shalt come out from among them, and thou shalt be separate ; for thy Redeemer hath ordained it : and thou shalt be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God ; for his apostle hath declared it.

But the righteous, also, “are recompensed in the earth.” What ! exclaims the self-sufficient pretender, is this our reward ? after all our mental agonies, our deep repentance, and our anxieties for our future welfare, shall we not be rewarded hereafter ? No, misguided man. “The righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*, as well as the wicked and the sinner.” As for your mental agonies, they are not merits : they constitute your recompense for unbelief. If you had made Him your refuge, whose “yoke is easy, and whose burden is light,” instead of depending on your own works, these agonies would not have been felt. Your repentance, according to its sincerity, is recompensed in the earth. And that anxiety for your future welfare, of which you boast, is the identity of that unbelief, disobedience and presumption, which constitute their own recompense. It is unbelief, because it is distrusting the *promises* of God : It is disobedience, because it is taking thought for the morrow ; and it is presumption, because it is undertaking your own salvation ; and thus trampling under foot the blood of the covenant, crucifying the Lord afresh, and putting him to an open shame. “But,” says the delinquent, “my minister exhorts his people to be thus anxious. He tells us, that we must take thought for the things of eternity. That we must take deep and effectual thought to secure that salvation, which, it is true, the Saviour came to accomplish, but which, we *fear*, he has not been able fully to effectuate.” And is it indeed true, that Christians are told, from the Christian pulpit, by a Christian minister, that Jesus hath imperfectly performed his office ! He came to redeem that which was lost by the disobedience of our first parents. He came to fulfil the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that, “in their seed, *all* the na-

tions and families of the earth should be blessed. He came pursuant to the “good tidings of great joy unto *all people*,” which was announced by the messenger from Jehovah’s court. He came to be “the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world* :” and yet, notwithstanding the unqualified nature of his mission ; notwithstanding the immense importance, of that which He came to seek and to save ; notwithstanding the omnipotence with which his embassy was vested ; notwithstanding that sacredness of character, that unlimited charity and good will to men, by which the Captain of our salvation was distinguished ; did they all prove insufficient ? And is the eternal purpose of God, which existed before the world, and which is called, in the parable, a great gulf which cannot be passed ; is this almighty and all-prevailing purpose thus cruelly abandoned ? My friends, this cannot be true. Our Jesus has not thus deserted the charge committed to him. He is faithful that promised ; and, eternal thanks and hallelujahs to his name, he hath not trusted our salvation out of his own almighty hands. We are indeed redeemed ! not from that perdition which was invented by the Romish Church, and which blazes only in the dogmas that emanate from that polluted source, and in the terrified bosoms of those who are thereby recompensed for their doubts and unbelief ; but we are redeemed from the dominion of sin, and restored to the favour of God. Who is there that thinks himself excluded from this redemption ? None but the maniac. The self-righteous do not think themselves excluded ; and the believer has the assurance that *none* are excluded. It is only the maniac, who has been driven to madness and despair by the frightful representations that teem from the Christian pulpit, after his weak intellect has been overpowered by those dreadful denunciations which a dogmatic priesthood have imposed upon the Christian world. Monstrous delusion ! what hecatombs of human victims hast thou already sacrificed ! How long wilt thou be permitted to wear the Christian name, deny the Christian faith, and destroy the Christian’s hope ! O ! when will mankind unite in adoring “the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world ?” When superstition and bigotry, and religious intolerance shall have submitted to the religion of Jesus ; then, and not till then, will this happy period arrive : and then will that pretended righteousness, which groans beneath the “recompense” of its impostures, no longer afflict the souls of its victims, nor imprecate the judgments of Heaven upon the children of men.

From the *National Advocate*.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

Among the publications of the day, a pamphlet has appeared, entitled “Excommunication of Mrs. Maria Towasend, from the communion of the Brick Presbyterian Church in Beekman-street, for persevering disbelief of the doctrine of the everlasting punishment of the wicked,” &c. Our curiosity and surprise were excited, not that any person should disbelieve in a doctrine contrary to reason, contrary

to Scripture, and contrary to the merciful character of the Almighty, but that in a country where reason is free, and opinions protected by law, any person should be *excommunicated* for a free expression of this belief. Indeed the word *excommunicated*, itself, startled us. We had read something of it in the laws of the *Visigoths*, *Chindasiunda*, and *Recessuinda*. At the period of the second crusade, under Louis the Young, and under Philip the Fair, some frightful edicts were published. Under that famous inquisitor, Torquemada, those who escaped the rack and the stake, were only mercifully *excommunicated*, and their property confiscated. The Sovereign Pontiff exercises the privilege of *excommunication*, but this was more a political than a religious rite, as most of the Christian Kings were under the control of the Pope; it is a power the most delicate, the most awful, because it reaches the soul, not the body; it effects the eternal, not the temporal felicity of men. Judge then of our surprise, that in this country, in this city, in this century, in the broad blaze of tolerance, reason, and philosophy, where the Almighty has enlightened, has spared, has protected; a woman is driven from His holy presence by a minister, because she doubted whether the wicked (and we are all wicked in thought or action) were everlastingly punished.

It appears that this lady had reflected seriously on the subject, and had addressed a pious letter to her pastor, Dr. Spring, a most worthy man, in which she gave copious extracts from the Old and New Testaments, calculated to disprove the doctrine so zealously maintained in that church, that there was no hope, no salvation, for the wicked. The trustees cited her to appear before them to explain or renounce her heresy, but as she had fully explained her opinions and convictions in her letter, she declined appearing, and begged permission tranquilly to retire from the church in all humility and love; it being understood that she had joined, or was about to join the Universalist Church, the doctrines of which appeared to her more in consonance with reason, and the merciful and forgiving character of God. She should have been tranquilly permitted to retire; because she had not abandoned her faith; she had not apostatized from her religion; her language is devout and pious; her principles are orthodox; but she reasoned and doubted the force of some polemical points, and she entered another sanctuary, and worshipped before another altar, and it is said in Scripture, "Wherever three persons are assembled in my name, saith the Lord, there will I also be."

A committee from the Brick Meeting waited upon her; endeavoured to "convince her of her error;" endeavoured to satisfy her that God could not pardon a repentant sinner, and that the wicked must be everlastingly damned. She remained firm and unyielding, defended the dignity, the mercy, and the loving kindness of the Great Jehovah, and they left her to her fate. The proceedings were as follows: At a meeting of the Session of the Brick Church,

Beekman-street, held in Session Room, Friday, June 28, 1822.

The committee in the case of Mrs. Maria Town-

send, reported, that they had called on Mrs. T. and made a last effort to convince her of her error, and they regret to say, that their efforts were without any salutary effects. Whereupon,

Resolved, That Maria Townsend be *excommunicated* from this Church, and that the first public annunciation of this sentence be made the ensuing Lord's Day.

Ordered, That the following minute be made in the above case.

Whereas Maria Townsend hath been, by sufficient proof, convicted of persevering disbelief of the doctrine of the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and after much admonition and prayer, obstinately refused to hear the Church, and hath manifested no evidence of repentance, therefore, in the name, and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, this Session pronounce her to be excluded from the communion of the Church.

Ordered, That the Clerk furnish Mrs. Townsend with a copy of the above proceedings in her case.

Memorandum taken by a friend of Mrs. Townsend.

The annunciation threatened in letter of 29th June, was made the day following, (Sunday) by Dr. Spring, from the pulpit, as near as my recollection serves me, in the following words—

"It has become my painful duty to announce that Mrs. Maria Townsend, a member of this Church, has for two years past, persevered in denying the doctrine of the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and has presented her children for dedication, at that place of *pretended* worship, where the doctrine is taught that the *wicked* will be saved as well as the *righteous*."

The above shows how far the power of the church would extend were it not shackled by law and restricted by public opinion. It proves something more—It proves that the doctrines of Christianity are not understood and practised in that church, because, in the decree of *excommunication* which was intended to drive this female from hope and eternity, another Christian Church is denounced as *pretenders*, because hope and salvation are held out to the repentant sinner in that church.

We heard a zealous churchman complain, that the Unitarians were spreading themselves over this country in formidable numbers, and were gradually sapping the foundation of the Christian Religion. If such is God's intention, man cannot prevent it; but we would ask if measures like the foregoing will not drive persons to any church rather than to one so unsocial and unnatural in its doctrines, so violent and intolerant in its measures?

Politics and Religion have been considered as noble subjects, and an affinity has been drawn between them; they are essentially different; we denounce a politician when he deserts his principles or his party, because man must be bound by some rules in the social compact; but who shall dare, in the name of the Most High, to banish his brother from the Throne of Grace and Mercy? Who shall presume to say, in the name of the Lord God, come not into the presence of thy Maker, fly to the desert.

look not on the face of God, for thou art cursed as an infidel and unbeliever?

We deeply regret to hear such doctrines broached, to see such power exercised; it is foreign from true religion, it is foreign from universal charity and good will towards men; an awful responsibility rests on him who drives any person from the altar, any supplicant from the Throne of Mercy.

From the National Intelligencer.

TO THE EDITORS,

Gentlemen—At the risk of being classed among the "INFIDELS," where certain mild, gentle, considerate professors of Christianity, have placed you, I must beg permission to offer a few remarks on the case of Mrs. Townsend, as detailed in a late pamphlet published in New-York.

Mrs. Townsend, it appears, having doubts respecting the truth of a single article of belief, professed by the communicants, of the church to which she belonged, wrote a letter to the Pastor, stating her dissent, and "*respectfully requesting a dissolution of her connexion with the Church, without a public trial.*" This request was denied; a Committee of Conference was sent to argue the point, who, finding her immovable in her belief, a session was held, and the following resolution passed, viz:

"Resolved, That Maria Townsend be excommunicated from this Church, and that the first PUBLIC ANNUNCIATION OF THIS SENTENCE be made the ensuing Lord's Day."

It is unnecessary to appeal to any man whose heart is not hardened into stone, by the influence of bigotry and fanaticism combined, in order to excite the keenest indignation at the stern and cruel disregard here employed towards the feelings of a respectable matron. I will venture to say, that there is nothing in the history of the bitter and inflexible warfare of different sects, in the most ignorant and bigoted ages of the world, more strongly marked with every character of daring and reckless inhumanity, than this case, which is a disgrace to the age, and a double disgrace to the country in which we live.

It is at war with the mild spirit of religion; it is an outrage upon the feelings of humanity; it is a wanton and cruel sporting with the heart of one who belongs to a sex, which none but brutes and cowards would dare thus to assail; it is an attempt to coerce men and women into a belief, in a particular point of doctrine, by the fear of public reproach and denunciation.

And this happens, this is permitted, in a country where it is solemnly acknowledged, nay, asserted as one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution, that a difference in religious opinions, shall not subject either man, woman, or child, to civil disability or clerical persecution! I should like to know what persecution is? If to drag a matron before the public, for the purpose of holding her up to the scorn and detestation of an assembled congregation, gathered together to hear the words of peace and good-will to all mankind—if to denounce her as an apostate from the true faith, and turn her adrift, as

it were, with the mark of Cain upon her forehead, to be an object of horror to her brethren and sisters, with whom she has been accustomed to kneel at the foot-stool of God, to offer up her prayers to the Throne of Grace—to utter her thanks, to ask forgiveness for herself and all her enemies—if this is not persecution, nay, the keenest, the most heart-breaking persecution, I know not what persecution is. At this moment, and for the remainder of her life, this helpless matron is, and will so continue, an object of indescribable horror to her most intimate associates; the ties which knit her to that circle, with whom she has been accustomed, perhaps from her infancy, to exchange the courtesies and good offices of friendly intimacy, are broken, most likely for ever. She will be thrown upon the world anew, to form new connexions with society, and when she meets any of her sister communicants in the church, that has thus flung her from its bosom, it will be their duty to pass her with an averted eye.

Is not this PERSECUTION? Is not this spirit, which dictated this PUBLIC OUTRAGE on the feelings and the good name of a respectable matron, the same which presided at the stake of the martyrs, the *auto de fes*, of the Inquisition, restrained, indeed, from such bloody excesses, by the laws, but still arriving at ends almost as cruel, through the circuitous wiles of a crafty church discipline? Does any one believe that, but for these restraints, the persecuting spirit that dictated this public exposure of a matron, for conscientiously dissenting from a particular point of faith, would have stopped short until it had persecuted her even unto death?

It is time, and high time, if it be not already too late, to put a stop to such open violations of the spirit of all those constitutions under which we live, to declare by a solemn act of the legislature, that no inhabitant of these United States, "by the blessing of God free and independent," forfeits his right as a citizen by dissenting from any particular system of belief—his right to the protection of his person, his property, ay, and what is dearer than all these, of his *reputation*, by entering or departing from a communion with any church, as his reason and conscience dictates. Let them stay with a church as long as they please, and when they request a dismissal let it not be accompanied by a PUBLIC DISCHARGE, as if they had committed some horrible crime.

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

AGENTS FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Capt. J. C. Churchill, Portland, (Me.) Theodosius Parsons, Esq. Holmes Hole, (Mass.) Messrs. Noah S. Bailey, Norwalk, (Conn.) Richard H. Woods, White Plains; Ralph Malbone, Brooklyn; Benjamin Wright, Jamaica; Ashbel Stoddard, Hudson; William R. Gregory, Ithaca, (N. Y.) Henry White, Petersburg, (Vir.) Timothy Bigelow, Pahrmyra, Portage Co. David Loring, Cincinnati; Horace Burroughs, Boardman, Trumbull Co. (Ohio.) Gershom D. Miller, Rahway; Williams Woolley, Morristown, (New-Jersey.)

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1823.

NO. 2.

ANOTHER EXCOMMUNICATION.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

We think we have never seen so abominable a specimen of the modern *bulls* of our orthodox clergy, as is to be found in the following *complaint, admonitions*, and excommunication. We present them to the public, for the same purpose that the ancient Spartans exposed their drunken slaves in the view of their children; that the odiousness of the spectacle might deter them from the practice.—*Editors.*

To the Rev. Ephraim H. Newton, Pastor of the Congregational Church of Christ, in Marlborough, (Vt.)

Whereas our beloved brother Hubbard H. Winchester, a member of this church, has for a long time been guilty of departing from the faith once delivered to the saints, in denying the endless punishment of the finally impenitent, and embracing the doctrine of Universal Salvation: also of disorderly walk, in setting himself up as a preacher of the gospel, without authority, and in advocating and propagating sentiments dangerous to the morals and souls of men; all which tend to bring a great scandal and reproach upon the religion of Jesus; and is a flagrant violation of the laws of his kingdom; and of his the said Hubbard's personal engagements to God and to this church:—and as I have endeavoured to convince him of his sin, and bring him to a sense of his duty, by labouring with him in the way required in the gospel, and he having refused to give or make christian satisfaction; I think it incumbent on me to give this information to the church, as a duty I owe to our common Lord, and to this my offending brother, that further measures may be taken, as the gospel directs, for reclaiming and bringing him to a sense of his duty.

JOHN GROUT.

Marlborough, March 5, 1822.

A true copy—Attest,

EPHRAIM HOLLAND NEWTON, *Pastor.*

Marlborough, March 3, 1822.

The Congregational Church of Christ, in Marlborough, to Hubbard H. Winchester.

Dear Brother—It is well known to you, that a complaint has been presented to this church against you, for *being guilty of departing from the faith once delivered to the saints, in denying the endless punishment of the finally impenitent, and embracing the doctrine of Universal Salvation; also of disorderly walk, in setting yourself up as a preacher of the gospel, without authority, and in advocating and propagating sentiments dangerous to the morals and*

souls of men. You also know, that you were cited to appear before the church, at a church meeting regularly warned and held at the meeting-house, and show cause, if any you have, why the aforesaid complaint is not supported. At which time you were called to answer to the charges in said complaint. After a long investigation of evidence, from your own lips, and a patient hearing of your defence, the church were so far satisfied from your own confession as to vote unanimously that the charges in the aforesaid complaint were supported. Whereupon the church felt it their solemn duty to proceed in their discipline according to the rules of the gospel, and did unanimously vote that you be publicly admonished.

You having been cited to appear before the church and congregation at this time, for the aforesaid purpose, I do now in behalf of the church, and in the name of the Great Head of the church, solemnly admonish you to look at your former high pretensions in your solemn profession before the church and congregation, in contrast with the instability of your mind, or the hypocrisy of your heart, in now denying the faith once delivered to the saints, and embracing doctrines in direct opposition to your former profession. Look also at the scandal you have brought upon the religion of Jesus, by assuming the office of a minister of the gospel, without authority, and, according to your own confession, in being guilty of the rashness and presumption of advocating and propagating doctrines dangerous to the morals and souls of men. Is there no sin in this? Can it pass without drawing a tear from your eye, or a sigh from your heart?

At your own request you were admitted a member of our communion, and received into the very bosom of our fellowship. You then in the presence of God, and the congregation of his people, professed your belief in the articles of our faith, and entered into a solemn promise, that you would walk in the ordinances, instructions, and administrations of this church, at the same time you professed to call upon the great Jehovah to witness the sincerity of your professions and vows. Is it possible, you can violate these promises and not sin? Can you break your vows, and trample upon the covenant you have made with God and man, and still feel undisturbed by the pangs of an accusing conscience? Vows and professions made in the presence of God are serious transactions. How far you have departed from these, it becomes you faithfully to examine, lest in the last solemn day, you be found among those who have drawn back unto perdition.

And now, dear sir, with all the affection of chris-

tian brethren, would we entreat you to look at your own heart; to your violated promises in neglecting the faith and discipline of this church; in embracing licentious doctrines, pernicious to holiness of heart, and in their tendency destructive to the future peace of precious souls. Look at the awful consequences of your conduct, in palming yourself upon the public as a preacher of the gospel, in a disorderly and disorganizing manner, by becoming *a blind leader of the blind*. Look at the responsibility which must rest upon you, in perverting the Scriptures, and in artfully beguiling others into the same dangerous and deadly path. Look forward to the awful day of accounts, when you must give up an account of your stewardship, and see the blood of souls which will be required at your hand. Look on your offended Redeemer, and weep and mourn in the exercise of godly sorrow, that he may have mercy on your soul. May the Lord give you repentance, lead you to a knowledge of the truth, grant you a heart to love and serve him, and of his grace save you.

Done by a unanimous vote, and in behalf of the church. Attest—

EPHRAIM HOLLAND NEWTON, *Pastor*.

Marlborough, April 3, 1822.

A true copy—Attest,

E. H. NEWTON, *Pastor*.

Marlborough, May 10, 1822.

Agreeable to a citation forwarded to the above named Hubbard H. Winchester, the foregoing admonition was publicly read before the church and congregation at Marlborough, at the close of divine worship in the afternoon, Lord's day, May 5, 1822.

Attest, EPHM. H. NEWTON, *Pastor*.

A true copy—Attest,

E. H. NEWTON, *Pastor*.

Marlborough, May 10, 1822.

The Congregational Church of Christ in Marlborough, to Hubbard H. Winchester.

Dear Brother—Whereas the church have considered you guilty of departing from the faith once delivered to the saints, in denying the endless punishment of the finally impenitent, and embracing the doctrine of Universal Salvation; also of disorderly walk, in setting yourself up as a preacher of the gospel, without authority, and in advocating and propagating sentiments dangerous to the morals and souls of men. You well know they have taken the steps of the gospel to reclaim you, by a course of labour and admonition, without effect. They have long waited with christian forbearance, to see you humble and penitent, but in vain. They still feel a cordial love and an attachment to you, and are unwilling to leave you without using farther exertions to reclaim you from sin, and bring you to the full enjoyment of the fellowship of the church. They have therefore unanimously voted, that you be publicly admonished the second time. You having been cited to appear before the church and congregation at this time, for the purpose aforesaid, I do now in behalf of the church, and in the name of the Great Head of the church, solemnly admonish you to consider well the consequences which inevitably

must result from your course of unyielding and settled perverseness.

Your covenant vows, your solemn promises and high pretensions to purity of heart, love of the truth, and attachment to the church, ought to be remembered. Is it possible that a violation of covenants and promises is consistent with the christian character? Can you bring your conduct at the bar of your own conscience, and have inward peace? Where is the moral tendency of your course, in presumptuously assuming the office of a public teacher of religion, that you may advocate and propagate doctrines dangerous to the morals and souls of men? Is the world benefited? Are the interests of society advanced, the good of mankind increased, and the kingdom of Christ built up by this conduct? Dear sir, we entreat you to examine your own heart and conduct, in a candid and faithful manner. For it is in vain we reason with you, or attempt to reclaim you from your wickedness, so long as your heart is shielded against the truth, with a fixed determination to pursue your own chosen way. How awful must be the condemnation of those who wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. Is it not reasonable that you hear us, and give heed to our entreaties, and save us from the pain of separating you from our number? This is the last act of labour, before the church proceed to pass the sentence of excommunication. Can you refuse to hear us, and reject this act of kindness? It is your eternal good we seek. Our hearts are open to receive you upon the pure principles of the gospel; so far as we know our duty, we have done every thing on our part to reclaim you. For a moment reflect, that all these acts of brotherly love, with all your violated promises, together with your disorderly conduct, and the mischievous influence of your sentiments, with the blood of souls, enticed and ruined through your instrumentality, will rise in judgment against you. In that solemn hour, what can you say in justification of your conduct?

To the rich mercy of God we commend you. Be assured you have our earnest prayers, that this admonition may be accompanied with a blessing, that you may return to the discharge of your reasonable duty, and a holy and pious life, that at last you may be gathered to the glory of the saints in heaven.

Done by a unanimous vote, and in behalf of the church.

EPHRAIM HOLLAND NEWTON, *Pastor*.

Marlborough, Aug. 26, 1822.

The above was publicly read, at the close of divine worship, Lord's day, Sept. 1, 1822.

Attest, E. H. NEWTON, *Pastor*.

The foregoing is a true copy of record on file.

Attest, EPHRAIM H. NEWTON,

Pastor of the Congregational Church of Christ in Marlborough.

Marlborough, Oct. 1, 1822.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

Whereas you, HUBBARD H. WINCHESTER, have been adjudged guilty of departing from the faith once

delivered to the saints, in denying the endless punishment of the finally impenitent, and in embracing the doctrine of Universal Salvation; also of disorderly walk, in setting yourself up as a preacher of the gospel, without authority, and in advocating and propagating sentiments dangerous to the morals and souls of men, and after due admonition, and much patience, do yet remain obstinate, giving no evidence of repentance: and it being the will and ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ, that his church have no fellowship with wicked and scandalous persons; but withdraw themselves from every brother who walketh disorderly, and cast such out of the church; and esteem and treat them as heathen and publicans.

I do therefore in the name, and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and with the consent and by a unanimous vote of this church, declare you, HUBBARD HARRINGTON WINCHESTER, excommunicated and cast out of the communion of the church of Christ; debar you from their privileges, and deliver you into the visible kingdom of Satan, for the destruction of thy fleshly and corrupt principles and practices, that thy spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

Done in behalf and by a unanimous vote of the church.

EPHRAIM HOLLAND NEWTON,

Pastor of the Congregational Church of Christ, in this place.

Marlborough, Vermont, Windham County, Nov. 1, 1822.

These certify, the above sentence was publicly pronounced at Marlborough aforesaid, in public assembly, Lord's day, Nov. 24, 1822.

Attest, E. H. NEWTON, *Pastor.*

A true copy—Attest,

E. H. NEWTON, *Pastor.*

Marlborough, Nov. 26, 1822.

T. G. ON FREE AGENCY.

(Continued from page 3.)

Gen. ii. 16, 17. If Adam had no freedom, then God (as I don't believe any other being had a power coequal,) must have made him (for you say he was not free to do it,) commit a deed which he had expressly forbidden, and then carries his threatening into effect. This death, in my humble opinion, means the loss of the image of his Maker; he became carnally minded; and to be carnally minded is death. This militates against the justice of God, unless sin is a requisite, and you seem to intimate it is in your concluding remarks,—“That the only motive God has in chastening the children of men, is, that they may be partakers of his holiness.” Would you chastise your child, he having committed no fault? Then a man must first sin, and then be chastised, in order to fit him for holiness. God, when he had created Adam, pronounced him good; (good and holy I take to be synonymous,) and you must agree there is no such thing as negative goodness; for if a man is not good, he is bad. Do you think Adam could not have partook of God's holiness, before he partook of the forbidden fruit? or

did his partaking make him any better than he was before? (viz. good.) If he could not, then the sinner would be warranted in doing evil that good may come. This savours too much of Hopkinsianism, which says, there is no more sin than is for the good of the whole world.

Matt. xi. 28. “Come unto me,” &c. Now if man had neither freedom or power to come, Christ being infinite in wisdom, he must have been acquainted with the moral inability of man, and certainly meant to deceive. Would it not have been more consonant with his divine character to have offered a petition to his heavenly Father, imploring him to bring them to him, and make them believe he would and could give them rest? On the other hand, it would be a mark of the greatest duplicity and folly; it would be like your chaining a man to a stake so that he could not stir, and then telling him to come to you, and you would make him king of the whole world.

Christ, weeping over Jerusalem, said, “How often would I have gathered you,” &c. “*but ye would not.*” Does this imply they had no freedom?—Isa. xxii. 8, 9. Heb. viii. 9. Is it not evident from these, that they exercised a free will? John xv. 7, “If ye abide in me, &c.” and verse 10, “If ye keep my commandments,” &c. How can they be said to abide in him, or to keep his commandments, if they did it not of their own free will? I could quote numerous other passages of similar import, but will content myself with quoting only one more. Isa. lv. 3. “Incline your ear and come unto me,” &c. Does not this infer that they had a choice; and if they had a choice, they must be free.

Your remarks on the popular phrases, agent, free agency, &c. (these being only the traditions of men, and prostitution of terms, as they are nowhere to be found in Scripture,) I consider no argument at all to the point. The terms “agent, agency,” simply implies *to act*, or acting, and does not require a second or third person; and I am warranted in using the terms, agent, agency, for any thing analagous to their definition, as laid down by all lexicographers, whether they are to be found in the Scriptures or not, and that too without being chargeable of a prostitution of terms. Would you call it a prostitution of terms, for me to call a man (believing in your tenets,) a Universalist? If you say, No, I should like to know in what part of the Scriptures you find the word Universalist?

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

T. G.'s observations relative to Adam, (see Gen. ii. 16, 17,) are nugatory. T. G.'s free agent's power to do evil, is no evidence of the possession of ability to do all the good man shall do, when he shall arrive at that perfection for which he was designed. God declared unto Adam the consequence of sin, which is death; or a state of mind denominated carnal mindedness, which consists in placing all the affections on objects which are insufficient to produce that joy and peace, which is called spirit and life. Thus—In the day thou eatest, or shall attempt to find *joy or life*, where death and sorrow

only are found, thou shalt be disappointed, and find sorrow and death. It was not necessary for God to carry his threatening into effect. Adam carried the threatening into effect, when he sought for happiness where misery abounds. It appears the free agent was so ignorant of God's character, as to suppose his happiness was abridged by the affectionate prohibition of that which, if indulged, would make him unhappy! And so ignorant of himself, and of cause and effect, that, like a foolish child, he thrust his hand into the fire, and then cried for the smart and pain. How absurd, yea, and ridiculous also, to prate about the power of *choosing* and refusing, of such a fool!

Here are a host of free agents for you. Take the whole house of Israel, and, after analyzing their powers of choosing and refusing, make a free agent of the whole lump. Hear the declaration of God, relative to their power of choosing and refusing: "The *ox* knoweth his owner, and the *ass* his master's crib, but my people *do not know*, Israel doth not consider." Shame on such free agents. Their boasted powers are below the *ox* and the *ass*! Are they free agents? A word of T. G.'s good men. God pronounced Adam (and all his works), *good*. But, if man is *so bad*, as our divine doctors say, that nothing will reclaim him, and he must be rejected by God world without end, where is his goodness? So far from ever being good, he was the worst thing in existence! The Creator of man, however, is the best judge of his value. He pronounced him *good*. Not *holy*. If Adam had been *holy*, his desires must have been *holy* also. But, you may say, If, then, Adam was good, his desires must have been good also. Granted. Unquestionably Adam's motive in giving heed to the solicitations of his wife, was good. Happiness is good. It was happiness that Adam pursued; but, being ignorant of the consequences of the conduct he was about to pursue, distrustful of God, hearing his wife, and taking her advice, instead of God's counsel, the poor free agent made a *great mistake*, and suffered as a consequence. A great mistake is a *great sin*. We hazard the declaration, that no man yet ever transgressed his Maker's commands, by doing any thing which, on the whole, made him the happier. God will never punish any man for increasing in happiness. Neither will God ever punish any man for making himself miserable. Man finds enough suffering in wrong doing, as a consequence of the wrong doing, to excite the pity and commiseration of his Heavenly Father, whose merciful purpose is, to save man from his *sins*, the cause of all his sufferings. How plain is *reason*! How convincing is *Truth*! Men work hard to burrow deep in absurdity, and cover themselves under the mantle which folly and obstinacy has wove, to hide them from the light of Truth, and obscure the rays of the Sun of God's salvation.

Again. Please to consider—The Adam that God made was good. For he was made from a good *motive*, and to answer a good *purpose*. God's motive and purpose are independent of man. It is not in the power of man to destroy God's work, and render nugatory and insufficient, the plans and pur-

poses of an infinite Being. Your free agent, powerful as he is, cannot do this! We read, the *thoughts of man's heart* are evil continually. Did God make the thoughts of man's heart? Why are the thoughts of man's heart *evil*? Ans. Because man is continually thinking of something to make him unhappy and miserable. *Misery is the greatest evil in existence*. And *sin* is a great evil, because sin produces misery. *Holiness is the greatest good in existence*. And holiness is the greatest good, because it produces the greatest happiness. Reader, this is the voice of reason and truth. "Whoso findeth me findeth life." Remember, God is a holy and good Being, because He is the Author and Source of all happiness. In proportion as you derogate from God's goodness, you rob him of his holiness, and vice versa. The god who would make his creatures endlessly miserable, is neither good nor holy; for goodness delights in happiness. A good man, in proportion to his knowledge and abilities, will make others happy. A wicked or bad man, will make others miserable. A bad man is a miserable man. A miserable man delights in misery. It is irrational to suppose, that any being whose mind is in a continual ferment, burning with envy, malice and revenge, can study to increase the enjoyments of others. We speak of men, as being comparatively good and bad. Considering the motive as stamping the character, and giving the colour for the time being. How *mutable* is man! To-day, he may brave death to oblige his fellow. To-morrow, smarting under an imaginary or real provocation, he may hurl his fellow to destruction. Is this the character of God? Impious thought! "He is of one mind, and none can turn Him." Hear him. "I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed!"

A word of the Hopkinsians,—There may be something that resembles truth, associated and smothered with that absurd hypothesis; like a drop of *fresh* water in the ocean, commingled and lost. The Hopkinsian jargon will have it, that tormenting a *part* of mankind endlessly, will be for the good of the *whole*. If Dr. Spring were to apply this to his congregation, and tell them, that the damning of the greater part of *them*, would be for the good of the whole, he holding that a greater part will be damned, any effort he might make to save some of the damned ones, would injure the residue; to say nothing of the effect which *consistency* might have upon the *whole* of his *salary*! But we say, as Dr. S. says, we presume, when he counts his \$3,750, the good of the *whole*, means the *whole*! For we very much question, whether Dr. S. with all his pretensions, would like to be damned, a la mode Hopkinsian, to benefit his *Deacons*! We believe that no more sin will be suffered to exist, than will be overruled for good. If there is more sin, than will ultimately be overruled for good, then sin must triumph, to the injury of man world without end; and to the displeasure and disappointment of God; who sent his Son to "finish the transgression, and to make an end of *sins*." Dan. ix. 24.

T. G. quotes Matt. xi. 28, and interrogates. We

answer—Christ did pray to the Father, “imploping Him to bring them unto him.” John xvii. 21. And Christ also declared, “No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him.” John vi. 44. Christ adds—“They shall be all taught of God.” (Taught to come.) “Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.” Will T. G. pretend, that any man who hath not heard, and not learned of the Father, will come unto Christ? Hearing and learning of our divine doctors, who love money so dearly, is quite another thing. Christ says, “Come. And the Spirit and the bride say, come. And whosoever will, let him come, and take of the water of life freely.” (Not conditionally.) Christ will repeat the invitation; and the Spirit and the bride will say, *Come*; until “all are taught of God,” and shall hear and learn of the Father! T. G.’s conclusion, therefore, is faulty.

T. G. next quotes, Christ’s weeping over Jerusalem; and asks, “Does this imply they had no freedom?” Ans. It implies, they had not heard and learned of the Father. Will your freedom do without hearing and learning of the Father?

T. G. then quotes Isa. xxii. 8, 9, Heb. viii. 9, and asks, “Is it not evident from these, that they exercised a free will?” No! It is an evidence that they were “slaves to sin!”

T. G. next introduces John xv. 7. If he had quoted the connexion, his free will would not have appeared with a very good grace. Read this—“Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you!!!”

T. G. has resorted to Lexicographers, so he says, to define the term free agent. It may appear uncivil, but duty compels us to say, that his Lexicographers are very ignorant. We should like to know, what Lexicographer says, “The terms agent, agency, simply implies to act, or acting, and does not require a second or third person!” Read the following—“AGENCY. s. The quality of acting; the state of being in action; business performed by an agent. AGENT. a. Acting upon, active. AGENT. s. A substitute, a deputy, a factor; that which has the power of operating.”—*Vide Walk. Dict.* First. The quality; acting for another. Second. The state; as an agent. Third. The business performed by a substitute or agent. Agent. a. The wheels of a carriage are agents. They are acted upon, and move as the horse impels them; who is acted upon by the driver. Agent. s. A substitute, a deputy, &c. and these have the power of operating. Now this is right in the face of T. G.’s Philologists! The term agent is applied to persons and things. It does not “simply imply to act, or acting.” It implies, when applied to a person, a substitute, deputy, or factor, who has the power of operating, &c. Enough of this.

T. G.’s remarks on the word Universalist, we think, are futile; because it is a word used to distinguish those to whom it is applied, from the sects who oppose them in sentiment. There is no meaning attached to the word which has any relation whatever to man’s powers, duties, or capacity in any shape. It is a word which means the whole; with a gratui-

tous termination; the *ist* being added, &c. In fine, the word Universalist is used by our friends and opponents, as an accommodation, we presume, but is never introduced seriously, as a prop in argument. We however, are willing to say we are *believers*, and let the term Universalist go for the most it will bring; and we advise T. G. to dispose of his phrase, *free agent*, in the same manner.

(To be continued.)

From the (Philadelphia) Universalist Magazine.
A SERMON

Delivered on the evening of the third Sabbath in February, 1823, before the First Universalist Church in Philadelphia, by ABNER KNEELAND, Pastor.

REVELATION xx. 10.

And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever.

Before we proceed to the discussion of this important subject, which has now been read for consideration, it is proper to notice, what is seldom noticed by clergymen, that the book called Apocalypse, or *Revelation*, is one of those books, the genuineness and authority of which, as Eusebius informs us, was, in the first ages of the Church, by some, called in question; and, as Dr. Lardner well observes, “should be allowed to be publicly read in Christian assemblies, for the edification of the people, but not to be alledged as affording alone sufficient proof of any doctrine.”* As a book of prophecy, the evidence of its divine authority must chiefly rest upon the perceived accomplishment of the predictions which it contains: so that it may be regarded as in a considerable degree independent of external evidence. In this, however, in the estimation of many learned men, it is far from being deficient: and for this reason, probably, more than any other, it has been almost universally received in modern times. Some learned men, however, who have even admitted the divine authority of the Apocalypse, have expressed a doubt whether this book was written by John the apostle and evangelist. The arguments of Dionysius, a disciple of Origen, and an eminently learned and pious bishop of Alexandria, in the third century, are contained in a large extract from a treatise of Dionysius, in the seventh book of Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History. They are thus abridged by Dr. Lardner: “Dionysius’s objections are five in number. 1. That the evangelist John has not named himself, either in his gospel or in his catholic epistle, but the writer of the Revelation names himself more than once. 2. That though the writer of the Revelation calls himself John, he has not shown us that he is the apostle of that name. 3. That the Revelation does not mention the catholic epistle, nor that epistle the Revelation. 4. That there is a great agreement in sentiment, expression and manner, between St. John’s gospel and epistle, but the Revelation is quite different in all these respects, without any resemblance or similitude. 5. That the Greek of the

* Lardner’s Hist. of Apost. and Evang. vol. i. p. 30.

gospel and epistle is pure and correct, but that of the Revelation has barbarisms, and solecisms. Dionysius's own opinion is, that the Revelation was written by some holy and inspired person named John, but who that John was he does not know: he might be John the Elder, said to have resided for some time at Ephesus, in Asia." Dr. Lardner, having examined the arguments of Dionysius at large, and stated the opinions of other learned men, concludes with his usual candour: "I must acknowledge that the Revelation, when compared with the apostle's unquestioned writings, has an unlikeness not easy to be accounted for."*

But it is not so material who wrote the Revelation, or when it was written, as it must be admitted that it required no inspiration to write an account of these matters more than that which was necessary to make a fair and honest record of what passed in view; for the whole was a vision, and therefore the writer could have had no will of his own in determining what he should see, or what he should hear. If we view it in any other light, it must be considered only the effect of a fruitful imagination. We shall, therefore, now, through the whole of our discourse, consider it as a real and true Revelation, not of St. John, the Divine, as called by our common translators, but as called by the writer himself, "*The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him.*" For we must consider it, either the revelation of Jesus Christ, or else no revelation at all.† For it is not even necessary to suppose that the writer fully understood it himself, as it was evidently designed for the benefit of the Christian world in all ages, as much as his own. The fulfilment, therefore, of this prophetic vision, will best enable us to understand its meaning.

We shall now come to the subject more immediately before us; and in approaching it, I would in the first place observe, that, in order to have a proper understanding of the various subjects treated of in this book, it is necessary, in the first place, to understand something of the nature of the symbolic language in which it is written. The mind will be much assisted in this inquiry, by comparing the prophetic periods of time with those mentioned in the prophecy of Daniel, particularly the forty and two months,‡ the three days and a half,§ the time, and times, and half a time, or the dividing of time.|| These several periods correspond, and in the language of prophecy, as has been universally admitted, amount to *twelve hundred and sixty years*, all of which show conclusively, that the prophecy of

Daniel, and the book of Revelation, allude to the same events, and the same period of time.*

Another circumstance to be attended to; and which will bring us more particularly to the subject before us, is, the imagery made use of in the vision, particularly the various living creatures that are introduced, and which help to heighten the grandeur and sublimity of the scenery. We are not to suppose for a moment (as no one in his senses can rationally suppose,) that these are real creatures which exist in nature; nothing more could have been intended than to introduce them as symbolical beings, and most of them have been so understood by all the best writers who have written on this subject. It is no more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the being called the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan, is a real being, merely because such a being is introduced into the symbolic language of this vision, than to suppose that the lamb with seven heads and seven eyes,† the beast with seven heads and ten horns,‡ the beast with two horns as a lamb, but which spake as a dragon,§ the woman that sitteth on many waters,|| the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit,¶ and many others which might be named, are real beings. These are all figurative or symbolical beings, whose true character, and what they represent, can only be known by what is said of them; and the probability is, that, although persons may be included, yet they represent certain powers, rather than the persons of any beings whatever. The characters given to these beings, and what is said of them, or to have been done by them, designate in a very clear manner what kind of powers they represent.

It may not be improper to consider a few verses of the context, in order to see our subject in a still clearer light. It is said, in verse second, that the angel who came down from heaven laid hold on the dragon, and bound him a thousand years; and, in verse four, the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus, and for the word of God, &c. lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years.** But the rest of the dead lived not, until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." I perfectly agree with Dr. Towers, and the learned authors, whom he has quoted, in his illustrations of prophecy, in believing that the resurrection here spoken of is altogether figurative,

* Lardner's Works, vol. iii. p. 130. See Improved Version, note.

† Sir Isaac Newton says, (Observ. on Apoc. p. 249.) "I do not find any other book of the New Testament so strongly attested, or commented upon so early as this." Dr. Priestly (Notes, vol. iv. p. 573,) says, he thinks it impossible for any intelligent and candid person to peruse it without being convinced that, "considering the age in which it appeared, none but a person divinely inspired could have written it." Thus we have given the substance of all the light we have on this subject, pro and con.

‡ Rev. xi. 2; 3. xiii. 5. § Rev. xi. 11. || Rev. xii. 14. Dan. vii. 25.

* "Now all these numbers," says Bishop Newton, "you will find upon computation to be the same, and each of them to signify 1260 years. For, 'a time,' all agree, signifies a year, and 'a time and times,' and the dividing of time, or 'half a time,' are three years and a half;" [which are the same as three days and a half, reckoning a day for a year,] "and three years and a half are forty-two months, and forty-two months are 1260 days, and 1260 days, in the prophetic style, are 1260 'years.' From all these dates and characters it may fairly be concluded, that the time of the Church's great affliction, and of the reign of Antichrist, will be a period of 1260 years." Vol. i. p. 488. Vol. iii. p. 380.

† Rev. v. 6. ‡ xiii. 1. § xiii. 11. || xvii. ¶ xi. 7.

** It has, says Mr. Lowman, as quoted by Dr. Towers, been correctly observed, "that all these expressions may very well be understood in a figurative sense. 'The souls of them which were beheaded for the witness of Jesus,' and which had not 'worshipped the beast,' may easily, according to the manner of prophetic language, signify persons of like spirit and temper with them, of like faith, patience, constancy, and zeal."

and is to be applied to the events of time, and not to eternity. Speaking of this, which is called the first resurrection, he says, "That this is also figurative, Dr. Whitby has largely, and in my opinion, decisively proved." "The true meaning of this symbolical representation," says Dr. Johnston of Holywood, "is this: at that period, the world shall be peopled with men of the same spirit and character, with the real martyrs of Christ; with men, who, like them, shall call no man on earth master, in matters of religion; who, free from the fetters of superstition and idolatry, and regarding the sacred rites of conscience, shall regulate their faith, worship, and conduct, by the infallible standard of the Word of God." With respect to the expression, says another learned writer, quoted by Dr. Towers, that they shall *reign with Christ*, it "may well be understood in a figurative sense, as we are said to be *crucified with Christ*, and to *live with him*; or as Christ himself is said to *live in us*. Gal ii. 20.

But after this happy period of the first resurrection, that is, when the thousand years are finished, satan, or the adversary, will be loosed out of his prison, and will go forth to deceive the nations—to gather them together to battle, &c. I would here ask my respected hearers, Is the deceiving of the nations, gathering them together to battle, &c. to take place in time, or in eternity? Most certainly in time, and on the earth. "And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and surrounded the camp of the saints, and the beloved city: and fire came down [from God]* out of heaven, and devoured them."

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever."

And the same arguments (from which I have only made a few selections,) which have convinced me that what goes before has relation to the events of time, have also convinced me, that, not only the text itself, but also what follows after, yea, all that is written in the whole book, has relation to the events of time, and their fulfilment is to be looked for on the earth. The bare circumstance of the judgment here spoken of being according to works, is, to my understanding, if there were nothing more, a sufficient proof of this. But more of this in its proper place.

The first thing which we shall notice particularly in the text, is the *devil* who deceived the nations.

I am well aware, my hearers, that a firm belief in the existence and reality of a being called *the devil*, has been supposed to be as necessary to the support of a certain doctrine, (and I need not name what that doctrine is,) as the reputation of the goddess Diana was to the craftsmen of Ephesus. "Ye know, Sirs, that by this craft we have our wealth." But whatever superstitious regard there may have been paid, in former times, either to the works of men's hands, or to mere ideal and imaginary beings, we feel ourselves no longer bound to give heed to such idle

tales or fantastical notions; because, were it possible for such a being to exist, he could not disturb, or in any way affect our eternal interest. If such a being exists, he must be either self-existent and independent, or else created and dependent. If the former, he is as likely to overcome, as to be overcome; and, of course, as dangerous to God, as he can be to us: if the latter, he can do nothing more than what he is permitted—and will God permit him to do any thing, which, on the whole, he is not willing should be done? Of what use, or injury, then, can the devil be to us, in relation to our final state? (For I am willing to admit that almost any being, even those far beneath us, may injure us here, and for the time being, but they cannot injure us eternally.) It has been generally supposed that the devil was once an angel of light, and by reason of pride, or some other enormous sin, he fell from heaven and happiness, and became a devil! But, we may be permitted to ask, what proof is there of all this? for there is not one word of any thing of the kind in all the Bible! But, were we disposed to admit the fact, we may still be permitted to ask, how did all this happen? We have been told that Adam, being created holy and upright, could not have sinned, had he not been tempted: but if he could not sin without being tempted, (that is, by some other being,) think, my hearers, of a holy angel, in whom nothing but purity dwelt; think of him as moving in that primeval light which surrounds the throne of God; how, I ask, could such a being sin without being tempted? and who tempted this holy angel of light to sin? No one. And if such pure spirits could sin, without having any thing more than their own nature to tempt them, why may we not suppose that man could sin, without any thing more than his own nature to tempt him, equally as well? From these, and many other considerations which might be named, I do not hesitate to say, that I have no faith in the existence of any real being, properly denominated *the devil*! Reason revolts at the idea of such a being; and Scripture, when fairly construed, will by no means support such an hypothesis.

The Greek word, *διαβολος*, which is here rendered *devil*, is from the middle voice, perfect tense, of *διαβαλλω*; which is from *dia*, *through*, and *ballo*, *to cast*. *To dart or strike through*; whence, in a figurative sense, *To strike or stab with an accusation or evil report, to accuse*. Hence, *διαβολος*, signifies *an accuser, a slanderer*; or, if you please, *an impostor*. It may be used, therefore, to represent, either the power of deceiving, in the abstract, or it may be applied to any being who is capable of deceiving, or who may attempt to deceive. Jesus saith, speaking to his disciples, "Behold, I have chosen you twelve, and one of you is a *devil*!" He does not say, One of you is like the devil; but one of you *is* a devil. Again, speaking to Peter, he saith, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" Not, for thou art like Satan, comparing him to any one else; but he calls him *the adversary*, the proper meaning of the word *satan*. If, therefore, Jesus had both a *devil* and *satan* in his own family, we need not look

* The words [from God,] are perhaps an interpolation.

beyond human nature to find "the devil, who deceived the nations." All that species of power, which may emphatically be denominated "spiritual wickedness in high places;" all that power which arises from human pride, combined with the base passions of man, calling to their aid, ignorance, bigotry and superstition; these may be considered the three characters mentioned in our text, the devil, the beast, and the false prophet. It is hardly necessary, however, to give a specific description of these different characters, as they cannot easily be mistaken. That the Apocalyptical beast, worshipped by the ignorant multitude enslaved by superstition, can be no less than the antichristian *god*, is a truth too clear to admit of a single doubt; because to this *god* both king-craft and priest-craft have given all the properties of a ferocious tyger. It is impossible to perceive the least show of mercy in this object of worship, any more than can be found in a lion yawning over his prey; because, if he spares any, it is because he has already glutted his appetite for vengeance on an innocent lamb!! This language, my hearers, may seem rather harsh and severe; but, let it be remembered, I am only describing the character of a beast, which, though he be worshipped as God, has no claim to such worship; and those who worship him are tormented day and night with fire and brimstone, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up continually.

But these symbolic personages are ultimately to share the same fate which they have marked out for others. Their end is destruction: which destruction is, and will be accompanied with much torment. All those who are in any way associated with the characters here represented, must participate in the sufferings which they are supposed to endure. The suffering is represented by being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone; which must ultimately put a period to that, together with their existence.

(To be continued.)

EXTRACT

From a Letter from President Adams, to the Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of Worcester.

"The most afflictive circumstances that I have witnessed in the lot of humanity, are the narrow views, the unsocial humours, the fastidious scorn, and repulsive temper of all denominations except one.

"I cannot conclude this letter without adding an anecdote. One of the zealous mendicants for the contributions to the funds of Missionary societies, called on a gentleman in Haverhill and requested his charity. The gentleman declined subscribing, but added, that there are in and about the town of —, nine Clergymen, ministers of nine Congregations, not one of whom lives on terms of civility with any other, will admit none other into his pulpit, nor be permitted to go into the pulpit of any other. Now if you will raise a fund to convert these nine Clergymen to Christianity, I will contribute as much as any other man. I am with great esteem, your friend.

JOHN ADAMS."

Selected.

INFANCY AND MATURE AGE.

AN APOLOGUE.

("Men are but children of a larger growth.")

'Twas eight o'clock, and near the fire
My ruddy little boy was seated,
And with the titles of a sire
My ears expected to be greeted—
But vain the thought!—by sleep oppress'd,
No father there the child desried;
His head reclined upon his breast,
Or nodding roll'd from side to side.

"Let this young rogue be sent to bed!"—
More I had not had time to say,
When the poor urchin rais'd his head
To beg that he might longer stay.
Refus'd; towards rest his steps he bent
With tearful eye, and aching heart;
But claim'd his playthings ere he went,
And took up stairs his horse and cart.

For new delay, though oft denied,
He pleaded;—wildly crav'd the boon;—
Though past his usual hour, he cried
At being sent away so soon.
If stern to him, his grief I shar'd;
(Unmov'd who hears his offspring weep?)
Of soothing him I half despair'd;
When all his cares were lost in sleep.

"Alas! poor infant!" I exclaim'd,
"Thy father blushes now to scan,
In all which he so lately blam'd;
The follies and the fears of man."
"The vain regret, the anguish brief,
Which thou hast known, sent up to bed,
Portrays of man the idle grief,
When doom'd to slumber with the dead."

And more I thought—when up the stairs
With "longing ling'ring looks" he crept,
To mark of man, the childish cares,
His playthings carefully he kept.
Thus mortals on life's later stage,
When nature claims their forfeit breath,
Still grasp at wealth, in pain and age,
And cling to golden toys in death.

'Tis morn! and see my smiling boy
Awakes to hail returning light;
To fearless laughter! boundless joy!
Forgot the tears of yesternight!
Thus shall not man forget his wo?
Survive of age, and death the gloom?
Smile at the cares he knew below?
And renovated burst the tomb?

O, my Creator! when thy will
Shall stretch this frame on earth's cold bed,
Let that blest hope sustain me still,
Till thought, sense, mem'ry—all are fled.
And grateful for what Thou may'st give,
No tear shall dim my fading eye,
That 'twas thy pleasure I should live—
That 'tis thy mandate bids me die.

¶ An adjourned Special Meeting of the members of the Second Society of United Christian Friends, will be held on Tuesday evening next, at No. 170 Bowery, at half past seven o'clock. The attendance of every member is requested, as business of importance will come before the Society.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1823.

NO. 3.

SERMON.

REVELATION XX. 10.

And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night, for ever and ever.

(Concluded from page 16.)

By the lake of fire and brimstone, some have understood the general conflagration of the earth, &c. when the elements shall melt with fervent heat. But, even were we to admit such an event, literally, (of which we have surely great reason to doubt,) I think that this must certainly be a very great mistake. This would be an ocean rather than a lake of fire. I am well satisfied, in my own mind, that the lake of fire and brimstone, literally, alluded to by the revelator, was the lake of Sodom and Gomorrah, which was alluded to only by way of figure, to denote the final destruction of whatever was cast into it, and the pain that would accompany such destruction. We have ascertained to a certainty, beyond all contradiction, that the fire of Gehenna, rendered "hell-fire," in the common version of the New Testament, is nothing more nor less, literally, than the fire that was kept constantly burning in the valley of Hinnom, in a place formerly called Tophet, on account of the abominable sacrifices of little children to Moloch, which place was a little south of Jerusalem. And as it is a fact equally well known, that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed with fire from heaven, which fire, as Dr. Whitby observes, continued burning (owing probably to the sulphur and other bituminous substances in the earth,) till the days of Philo Judæus, who lived in the second century of the Christian era, why is it not probable that this was called, in the days of the apostles, "the lake of fire and brimstone?" Well might Jude call it *aionian*, or everlasting fire; for as it had been then burning near two thousand years, it was natural for him to speak of it as a perpetual fire; for it had lasted from the days of Abraham, and, for ought he knew, would continue for ages. It is now, however, become extinct; and whether this be the lake spoken of, or alluded to, in our text, and again in the concluding verses of this chapter, is not material; because, whatever may be the literal meaning, it undoubtedly here should have a figurative application. Whoever can believe that a beast, or any other being, can be literally tormented in fire and brimstone, even one day and night, much less day and night for ever and ever, possesses a mind not capable of reasoning, or being reasoned with on such a subject.

The next circumstance we shall notice in our text, is, the expression *day and night*; which shows, I think, that the torment, whatever it be, is limited to time; for we have no account that time will be measured in eternity by the succession of day and night. As the devil, therefore, who deceives the nations, is tormented day and night, it must be while the sun, moon and stars, move on in the same order as they do at present.

The duration of this torment is expressed by words which are rendered in the common version *for ever and ever*. That this is not a literal rendering of the words, nor the true meaning of the original, is admitted by every Greek scholar who has ever written on the subject. For a full explanation of these words, see my Lectures on Divine Benevolence, pages 189, 199, inclusive. The argument there advanced was first published (that is, by me,) in 1805; and again repeated, in another work, in 1816; again in my Lectures, in 1818; and now in this discourse, in 1823; in each and every time the learned clergy have been respectfully invited to refute it, if incorrect. It is simply this, which is here not stated in full, but only in its material point; any word signifying duration which may be used in the plural as well as singular number, cannot express the idea of eternity. Eternities, in English, would be a solecism; and the idea in Greek would be equally absurd. But the Greek phrase, *eis tous aionas ton aionon*, rendered in the text *for ever and ever*, is literally *to the ages of ages*. Now if *aion* an age, signified eternity, *aionas* ages, could signify no more than eternity; and *ages of ages*, ever so many times repeated, could not add to the duration: but if *an age* mean an indefinite period of time, then *ages* is an indefinite number of such periods; and *ages of ages* is still a greater number, but at the same time as much limited as a single age. The reason is plain and obvious; because, when you have added ever so many periods, or ages, there is still room to add as many more; and so you might add at pleasure, *ad infinitum*. But as I have also fully explained these words, together with the adjective *aionon aionian*, (rendered *everlasting* or *eternal* in the common version,) in the preface of my New Testament, which may ere long be in the hands of every one who is disposed to read, it is unnecessary that we should enlarge upon it here.*

By casting your eye upon the 20th and 21st verses of chap. xix. it will be perceived that "the beast

* We have progressed in this work as far as Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and the whole will be out in the course of the ensuing summer. The first volume of the Greek and English Testament is now ready for sale by the Editor.

was taken, and the false prophet who was with him ; these two were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." That I am not altogether singular in my ideas of this subject, I shall now show, by a few quotations from different authors, as quoted by Dr. Towers. "This *lake of fire*," says Daubuz, "is but a symbolical notion, or representation of the perpetual continuation and unchangeableness of that state, into which those matters are reduced, which are said to be thrown therein ; implying that they shall no more affect mankind, as being to them utterly destroyed." "For," says Dr. Lancaster, "we must consider, that the beast and false prophet are bodies politic, and perpetual or successive ; and that the design is here to show us, that Christ will not only destroy at last the persons who are at that time in possession of what is signified by the Beast and false prophet, but also extirpate the succession of tyranny and false prophecy for ever. So that the beast and false prophet are persons in a double capacity ; that is, persons in general, enemies to Christ, and also in possession of power, which is to be extinguished with them. And therefore their particular judgment must be considered with this double view."

It is a little remarkable, however, that so able and learned a writer as Dr. Towers, who admitted that the present subject under consideration, as well as those which follow in the 21st chapter, allude only to the events of time, should also admit that the following verses (13 and 14,) in the chapter which contains our text, should allude to a future judgment or a future state. This, however, he has done, in a note on page 366, vol. ii. But if the other parts are to be understood figuratively, and apply to the events of time, particularly those who are "before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple ;" (chap. vii. 9, 13—17,) which is the opinion of many learned authors, (with whom I most cordially agree,) then I do not hesitate to say, that the dead, death and hell, or hades, spoken of in the 13th and 14th verses of this chapter, are to be so understood. Our text speaks of the punishment, which must evidently terminate in the destruction of the causes of evil, namely, the beast ; which, as well as his image, has received so much homage and adoration by an apostate and antichristian church ; the false prophet, or false teacher, who has recommended the beast as a proper object of worship ; and the impostor, or deceiver, by whom the nations have been so deceived, as to mistake the Apocalyptic beast for the true and living GOD !! For we cannot suppose for a moment, that the nations would ever have been so foolish as to worship a beast, or his image, knowing it to be a beast, or, what is worse, the mere image of a beast ; nor could they have been prevailed on to have done so, unless they had been so deceived as verily to believe him to be God. After thus disposing of the causes of evil, the judgment of mankind is represented ; who, being dead in trespasses and sin, or else dead in unbelief, are judged with equity according to their works. Then follows a figurative representation of the destruction, not of the causes of evil, but of evil

itself ; namely, of death and hades ; "and death and hades are cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death," or, as it is according to Griesbach, "This is the second death, *even* the lake of fire." And, says Dr. Towers, "Here also the expression has a figurative acceptation : here also it denotes, not torment, but destruction : here also it is applied, not to a real, but an ideal personage." Every thing that bears the name of death, or the receptacle of the dead, namely, *hades*, that is, hell or the grave, must here have an end : or, as Dr. Watts has beautifully expressed it,

— "death itself shall die !"

This awfully sublime subject, therefore, so far from presenting the least terror to my mind, is one of the most joyful scenes represented in all the book of revelation. For I consider all that is here represented, as being absolutely necessary, preparatory to what is represented in the next chapter, particularly verses 1st and 7th inclusive. And even this happy state of the new heaven, and the new earth, I do not carry into eternity, as I once did, (although such a state will undoubtedly exist there in a much more refined sense,) but I think that the state here represented, will better apply to a long and happy period on the earth ; and in this I agree with many of the most learned commentators on this subject. "Because of this felicity," says Paganus, as quoted by Dr. Towers, speaking of this very subject, (viz. of the new heaven and the new earth,) "all former troubles will be forgotten. There will be no more plagues, nor shall the Christian die an unnatural death ; but after a long life, by a gentle change be translated into the life to come." By the expression, "*there shall be no more death*," is signified, says Crellius, "that there will be no more violent deaths ; for those few which shall happen, will not be worthy of being included in the general account." Many more of a similar nature might be quoted, if it were deemed necessary, to establish the point for which we are now contending ; which is, that the whole of this book has relation to the events of time ; and some have even gone so far as to suppose that all its representations have been fulfilled. To this latter idea, however, I am not prepared to subscribe ; for no event which has yet taken place can in any sense answer to the description given of the *new heaven*, and the *new earth* : not that I think there will ever be a new earth, literally, much less a new heaven, but something that will answer more fully to the description given in this book than any thing which has yet been experienced by mortals.

Thus, my friendly hearers, I have endeavoured to give you all the light I am capable of giving in one short discourse on so important a subject. If the view we have taken of this subject be correct, (of which there can be no reasonable doubt,) it changes the whole complexion of the final conclusion of this prophetic vision. Instead of beholding, in awful anticipation, by far the greater proportion of the human race cast off eternally into a lake of liquid fire and brimstone, there to be tormented with devils and damned spirits to the wasteless ages of eternity,

we behold, not only all the causes of evil, but evil itself, of every description, totally and completely extirpated, destroyed, and eradicated from the moral and religious world. Whether the lake of fire spoken of in our text be material or symbolical, it matters not, if this figurative language represents the source, or cause, or even if it be in proof of the existence of never-ending misery, it unfolds to the mind horrors indescribable; such as it is impossible to conceive that any but a merciless tyrant could ever inflict! But if the view we have taken be correct, it is perfectly congenial to all the good and pious feelings of a good heart. There is no one, however good, or however pious he may be, if he be endowed with reason and understanding, who is not willing either to endure pain himself, or to inflict it on others, if it be necessary, to get rid of a greater evil. Who will not undergo the pain of amputation, for the sake of getting rid of a diseased limb, which would otherwise endanger the life of the whole body? On the same principle, whatever pain or suffering may in any way be necessary to renovate the world, even should it be left to the world whether they would submit to it or not, you would find the majority of mankind, yea, all the virtuous, ready at once to submit. Convince also the most vicious, that it would be for their interest and happiness so to do, and they would not long resist. We have no idea that these things will ever take place suddenly, or all at once. But there will be a gradual progression of light and knowledge: and as light and knowledge increase, darkness, error, ignorance and superstition will be dispelled; and mankind themselves will be made as happy as is admissible in this mutable and mortal state. Instead of looking forward, therefore, to the day, when *whosoever is not found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire*, with dread, and fearful apprehension, I hail it as one of the most joyful eras recorded in all the sacred volume. Then will be brought to pass the truth of the following testimony, (ch. xxi. ver. 3.) "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they will be his people, and God himself will be with them, and be their God; and he will wipe away all tears from their eyes, and death will be no more; for the former things are passed away." Where is the heart that will not exult for joy at such a glorious prospect? Where is the heart that will not say, "Amen—Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

T. G. ON FREE AGENCY.

(Concluded from page 13.)

I was strenuously opposed to the free moral agency of man, till I read Baxter's Inquiry into the Nature of the Human Soul; and, with your permission, I will quote his ideas on that point. "Without freedom, there cannot be a thinking being; but only a bare percipient being: for thinking implies the turning the perceptive capacity from one perception to another, by an act of the will; otherwise a percipient being would have but one solitary perception always in view. And if the being doth not

this by an act of the will, but is impelled by an external (or internal) principle, how can it be said to think, being acted, and not active, in every thing beyond bare perceptivity? What is it to will? Is it not to act? If it be to act, it is to have the internal principle of action; and if it hath the internal principle of action, it must be free, and needs not be further acted or impelled in thinking. An active being, a thinking being, and a free being, then, are synonymous terms." (Vide Vol. I. p. 203.)

It is a matter of little import, what terms are used to denote the freedom of man in choosing good or evil. With deference, I think your remarks still leaves the question unanswered.

Your remarks on rewards and punishments I shall notice but very briefly. For, till the accountability of man is disproved, it would be superfluous nonsense to talk of punishing him justly for any sin he may commit; for if he does it not of the free volition of his own will, he cannot be accountable. "T. G. is a father," &c. Then, say you, "Now a question arises, how T. G., consistently with justice, can punish one of his children for a moment, seeing the child so punished is impelled by some kind of secret influence to commit the deed for which he is punished." If I am the secret influence, or cause, (as your remarks intimate God is, unless you admit some other power coequal,) of that child's disobedience, I confess I cannot, consistently with justice, punish the child at all. You would call me a very inhuman father, if I was to put my child's hand into the fire and burn it, and then whip the child for it. And you would not be apt to believe me, when I told you that I did it for the child's ultimate good. You would laugh at a physician, and call him insane, if he was to come to you and tell you, "Now you are a man in perfect health, but it was necessary that he should make you sick, almost unto death, merely to exhibit his skill and benevolence (as he perhaps would call it,) in restoring you to your former health; for if you enjoyed perfect health before, he could not make you more than perfect. Now, if I can only be good, I shall not envy the man that may be better. Should you deem the present worthy of your comments, you will add an additional favour by publishing them. Hoping that we shall both keep in mind, that speculative knowledge alone only puffeth up the soul with self-conceit, while charity and love edifieth.

I am, dear sir,

Yours, respectfully,

THOMAS GAMBLING.

New-York, 17th April, 1823.

NOTE.—That your remarks intimate that sin is requisite, is proved in this instance, that when God had created man, he pronounced him good; now can he be better than good? "Yes, say you." How? "By eating of the forbidden fruit, by breaking the command of God; in doing these, and being chastised, he is thereby made partaker of God's holiness. If this does not make sin necessary, I am at a loss to know what will, unless you can prove it no sin to break the commands of God. Should your hypothesis be true, I seriously doubt of there being any

such thing as *sin*, (or evil,) as I have never found any lexicographer that would warrant me in calling that *evil*, which is productive of good.

REMARKS.

T. G.'s quotation from Baxter's Inquiry, shall have all the weight and credit it deserves; giving T. G. the privilege of securing, to himself, all the advantage to be derived from it. But, the reader will please to remember, that reason and facts have their claims, and will be heard. Now, the sum total of Baxter's logic, is this,—“An *active* being, a *thinking* being, and a *free* being then, are *synonymous* terms.” Well, so be it. A *dog* is an *active* being, a *thinking* being, and, consequently, a *free* being! So much for Baxter. We entreat T. G. to remember, and to ponder well the declaration of Jehovah, by his prophet, (Ezek. xxxvii.) “Ye shall know that I am the Lord, [When shall these free agents know this? Ans.] when I [not you,] have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit* in you, and ye shall live.” These people are described as more ignorant than the *ox* and the *ass*! Therefore, the conclusion, more irresistible than Baxter's, follows, that T. G.'s free agents are *ignorant* of the right way; and, however free they may be, they neither *know* nor *consider*!

T. G. is of opinion, that it is of small consequence what terms are used to denote the *freedom* of man, &c. We inform T. G. that he is *free*, according to his use of the term, to fly across the Atlantic, and to light upon Europe's shores. There are no laws to prevent it. Man is, in this sense, free to do and know all good. But, the declaration is, “My people shall be *willing* in the day of my power.” And we take the liberty of adding—They will not be willing at any other time or period.

T. G. continues—“Your remarks on rewards and punishments, I shall notice but very briefly. For, till the accountability of man is disproved, it would be superfluous nonsense to talk of punishing him justly for any sin he may commit,” &c. Supposing T. G. had said, *If* the accountability of man is disproved, &c. T. G. is accountable for all his knowledge and powers, and no more. If T. G. should attempt to fly to France, and sustain damage by the attempt, he would receive a meet recompense or punishment, as a consequence. Please to prove that man is punished in the abominable manner so many contend for, before the position is taken for granted. We ask T. G., as a father, whether he would be justifiable in *permitting* his ignorant child to run into the fire, when no good could result to the child from the burn and pain? Mankind, in an adult state, are but *great children*. Their toys and playthings are different; we grant, from the playthings of *little children*; but seldom more harmless, innocent, or more productive of enjoyment. What is the great bustle about? Alas! it is vanity; and vexation of spirit is the fruit of it. God is the great, the common Father of mankind. Like the prodigal, they leave their Father's house, where there is

* Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” And not elsewhere!

enough and to spare, and go where they perish with hunger! How deplorable is the picture of human folly, (call it *wisdom*, if you please,) and human imbecility! How preposterous and absurd, the conduct of man!

God, for wise and good purposes, permits man to pluck the rose of wisdom from the bush of experience; that the lacerations which are caused by the thorns and briars of disappointment, may teach him knowledge. It is when the eye pierces the horizon of time, leaps, at a bound, the vista of ages and dispensations, that the winding up of the great drama is seen, and the ways of God justified to man. To man, now estranged from his God, and a wanderer in this wilderness of tears, the Father of Mercy is embosomed in clouds, and darkness is the habitation of his throne. But, “there is another and a better world.” A day, whose sun will never set. A Sun, whose radiant beams shall chase away all gloom, and shine with righteousness into every mind. Tell me no more of the *freedom* of blinded man. His ignorance precipitates him into various and complicated errors, which cause his misery; but, the *freedom* of God's love, boundless as his immensity, will set the prisoner free, and reveal the glories of the brightest heaven.

Of T. G.'s note, we remark—T. G. has misrepresented us. God chastises us, that we may be partakers of his holiness. If man already partook of God's holiness, he would never sin. Wisdom would point the path to happiness. But, Adam, good as he was, (God made him good,) was not holy.

Of the necessity, or utility of sin, we remark—To *sin* is to *mistake*. If God could not be known to man, in all the endearing characters of Father, Preserver, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, unless man was placed in the condition which would make him the recipient of God's infinite perfections; and if it was necessary, for man's happiness, that he should *know God*, in all these glorious characters, then, we say, unhesitatingly, *Sin was necessary*! We believe T. G., and every other rational man, will approach the above premises, and their conclusions, with reverence and awe. They are premises, which, like the fibres of a root, have the glory of God for their Author and support. We say, of these premises, they are the First and the Last! Human conception can find no substitute. They are emblazoned on heaven's great canopy—engraved on the face of every globe—and, in the revelation of God's Word and Will, they shine with the lustre of eternity.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

A DREAM.

“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream.”

Having devoted some time to the serious contemplation of weighty subjects, which relate to a hereafter state, about which our learned clergy so much preach and converse, and about which there is so much concern among the good people of these United States; and having contemplated the means

which are practised to procure money for the purpose of saving the souls of the heathen from the divine vengeance, in the next world, I became fatigued with the multitude of thoughts, when sleep gently drew the curtain of forgetfulness over me, leaving my imagination free to wander as the multitude of subjects previously contemplated, might lead, when reason and judgment had become dormant.

The first scene which arrested my attention was a vast host of clergymen, dressed in superfine, soft raiment; showing, by their countenances, that neither the stall nor the vine was their *step-mother*. These were busily employed in going from house to house, and with the most pitiful visages, and plaintive voices, were begging from the rich and the poor, the wise and simple, every farthing possible, beseeching every one to spare a little, urging that the souls of millions of people, many thousand miles off, could be saved from the vindictive vengeance of their Creator and Preserver, by means of these donations. I saw these clergy go into kitchens and beg money of maids, who labour hard for a small pittance; and the language was so plaintive, so softening; and the hearts of those laborious females were so tender, and quick of sensibility, that these beggars actually succeeded in obtaining no small proportion of their earnings. I was so affected at this sight that I wept; for though it was a dream, yet reason was enough in exercise to assist in reflecting, that those clergy were richly dressed and plentifully fed, their hands were as delicate, as the hand of an infant, not being stiffened or hardened by labour; but the poor, industrious maids were in mean apparel, and their hands and fingers were so stiff, that they could but awkwardly put their hard earned shillings into the delicate hands of these ministers.

I saw likewise, these beggars go to little children and plead with them, to drink their coffee and tea without sugar, and get their parents to give them as many cents a week as their sugar would cost, that they might give the money to the ministers, that they might lay it out in saving the souls of men from the vengeance of God. Indignation now prevented my tears. I could not suppress my resentment. I thought I stepped up to one of these orthodox beggars, and told him plainly and directly, that I really believed him to be a rank deceiver and hypocrite. He stared me in the face, and I him as sternly. In a moment I broke the silence, and asked him whether he was not ashamed to deprive little children of those agreeable relishes, which the kind God of nature had rendered both palatable and nourishing? The ghostly hypocrite began to mutter over some incoherent sentences, respecting saving the immortal souls of the heathen from going to hell; when I interrupted him, and asked him to show me his authority for pretending that the eternal welfare of immortal souls depended on a little money, which he could get from the hand of hard labour, or from the tea and coffee cups of little innocent children? His countenance now fell, and he cast his eyes toward the ground, as if he felt guilty. I improved the

moment and the occasion to draw his attention to another question. I asked him what he meant by the *blasphemous* pretension of saving souls from the vindictive wrath of God? which pretension supposed that God, the Creator and Preserver of men, was their deadly enemy, and that he and his brother beggars were engaged in saving men from the enmity of God.

As is usual in dreams, this seemed to vanish; when I saw the clergy with each a bag in his hand with the following label—*Missionary Rag Bag*. I saw them travelling from place to place, begging rags of every person they met; pleading, with tears in their eyes, as if they were in an agony, saying, that a few rags might be the means, by the blessing of God, of saving an immortal soul from the divine wrath to all eternity. I dreamed that women and children were so moved with these entreaties, that they searched their houses, from garret to cellar, to save immortal souls! As I seemed to muse on this scene, I recollected the following words; Rev. i. 5, "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." Within myself I then reflected—what has *money*, or what has *rags* to do in the work of man's eternal salvation? I also recollected the words of Peter to Simon, Acts viii, 20, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought the gift of God may be purchased with money." Such were the emotions of pity for my deceived fellow mortals, and of indignation towards these deceivers, that I awoke—and behold it was a dream.

THE CAREFUL MOTHER.

An elderly lady residing in Connecticut, wrote recently to her son, cautioning him to beware of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. We extract the following from her letter; being permitted so to do, on condition of offering a few remarks, which may have a tendency to remove the lady's prejudices.

"I hope better things of you, and I hope I may never be disappointed. I think it a sorrowful thing to trifle with *religion*." Speaking of those who had attended a meeting where this doctrine was preached, she says, "Their eyes are blinded, and their consciences seared, or they could not hear such *foolishness*. They are *Deists* in earnest. If I thought you would ever notice one of them again, I never would wish you to come in the place again. This Universal doctrine only *hardens* the heart of man, and they *abuse* God's mercy, and make a *mock* of the Scriptures. Who inspired these men with this false religion, to please Satan? But you know we read of these things; for towards the latter end there will be false teachers, and false *prophets*; and these are the times. I am fearful it weakens the minds of many with that *pleasing* doctrine that *all* will go to heaven. But we will let them talk of their *new* worship. We are not obliged to join them; and as for *reasoning* with them, we cannot, unless we *throw away the whole Bible*, and have nothing to do with it; for they do not hold to Scripture." &c.

To convince this lady of her mistake, we shall reason with her from the Scriptures; requesting

her to remember that the Scriptures will not authorize her to "bear false witness against" any class of people whatever, however unacquainted she may be with their practices and doctrines. Was this lady aware that she was exhibiting serious charges, implicating the characters of a numerous class of the community? Has she *evidence* to support her assertions? If not, we appeal to her, and ask, How will you justify yourself, in thus judging others, and condemning them for practices and professions, when you are ignorant of their guilt or innocence? Whatever you may allege in justification, can you plead, Not guilty?

You speak of "trifling with religion." What is religion? Is it long prayers, and hypocritical pretences? No! "Pure religion and undefiled before God, even the Father, is this, To visit the *fatherless and widows* in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world." Do Universalists *trifle* with this religion? Are not they charitable and humane? are not their sympathies for suffering humanity, as active as in other people? Why do you call their faith and preaching *foolishness*? Is it folly to believe God, who has *sworn*, that in the seed of Abraham, Christ, *all* the families and nations of the earth shall be blessed? Is it folly to preach with the apostle, that Jesus shall bless every one of you, by *turning you away from your iniquities*? Why do you call them *Deists*, when they believe the Scriptures to be a revelation of God's word and will? Do Deists believe this?

We respectfully, but earnestly, urge this lady to *examine herself*. What spirit is this, which you possess, which *despises* others? Why do you threaten your son, if he, like his divine Lord and Master, should eat and drink with "publicans and sinners?" What was the conduct of Christ, whom your son is bound to follow? Did he court the company of the holy men of his day? The men, the Pharisees of old, who arrogated to themselves all the religion, and despised their neighbours as unworthy their notice! No. He was the friend of *sinners*. He visited them. None, however vile in the estimation of the Pharisees, were beneath his kindly notice. How *different* was his conduct, from that which you counsel your son to pursue! Remember the declaration of Christ—"He that is not for me is against me." Are you for Christ? Alas! friend, unless you gather with him, you are not neutral, you scatter abroad!

Again. You say, "This Universal doctrine only *hardens* the heart." Answer, we beseech you—What doctrine is this, which you believe, which *hardened* your heart, to that degree, that you could threaten your son with rejection, and despise his presence, should he imitate his Saviour, and visit sinners? Was it the spirit of *love* or *hatred*, which dictated this threatening? How harmonious and gloriously triumphant is truth! "The mother may forget," says God, "but I will *never* forget you!" What evidence have you, that Universalists "abuse God's mercy?" Do not they contend in the language of inspiration itself, that "God's mercy *endureth* for ever?" They do. They declare, with the

prophet, that "God will not cast off for ever, nor be always wrath." That God is "good to *all*, and his *tender mercies* are over all his works." Those abuse God's mercy, who restrict it to a favoured *few*; and represent "the God of the whole earth," who "is *love*," as the enemy of souls whom he hath made.

How serious is the charge, that "they make a *mock* of the Scriptures?" Do you know this to be a fact? or have you uttered, in the moment of irritation, an unjust accusation? Universalists declare, with the prophet, "*All* nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; *and* all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." To deny this testimony, and to pretend to believe the Scriptures, is solemn mockery indeed. You ask, "Who inspired these men with this *false religion*?" &c. We answer—The religion, or faith of Universalists, is that doctrine which Peter spoke of, when he declared, of Jesus, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of *restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 21. They testify the same that all God's holy prophets have testified! Were they *false prophets*? Are not they *false* prophets, who, instead of testifying of the *restitution of all things*, preach the reverse, and consign a majority of the creatures whom God hath made, to never-ending wretchedness?

You speak of the doctrine of the salvation of *all* men, as a very pleasing doctrine; calling it "that *pleasing* doctrine, that *all* will go to heaven!" You are right. Reverse the proposition. Let the *hell* of modern religionists pass in review before you. Contemplate its horrors. Harken to the moans, the complaints, the undecipherable anguish and heart-rending cries of its victims. Hast thou *pleasure* in this? Infuriate zealots, when reason is prostrate beneath the iron sceptre of discordant and hateful passions, and humanity is exiled from the breast, may utter a hellish expression of satisfaction; but *humanity* itself, uncontaminated with *modern purity*, could not descend so low, nor be divested of the last particle of natural affection, Show me the man who delights in *misery*, and deliberately projects the plans for another's wretchedness, and I will show you *the Devil*! 'Tis a *pleasing* doctrine! Paul, thy testimony bears faithful witness of this truth. Thy bosom swelled with anticipations of future glory, while thy tongue proclaimed the joy of thy heart. Thy compatriots in truth bore like testimony; and a cloud of witnesses declare, that "our God, is the *God of salvation*." We reiterate their acclamations, and say, "*Rejoice, evermore*." O clap your hands, *all ye* people, shout unto God with the voice of triumph. I will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever: with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, *Mercy* shall be built up for ever, thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. *Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound*; they shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy

countenance. In thy name shall they rejoice all the day: and in thy righteousness [mercy] shall they be exalted."

You call the worship of believers in God's impartial goodness, "a new worship." *New*, say you? When the "morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," this, the *boundless* mercy of God, was their theme. When man first lifted up his eyes to heaven—when first his bosom expanded with gratitude, and his heart breathed an aspiration toward his Maker, it was the mercy, the love, of God, which lighted the flame divine, and gave a foretaste of the blissful scene. It was the song of all the prophets. Inspiration *fired their tongues*, when the spirit sat on them, in a later day, and confirmed the tidings of God's love to man. Surely, it may be *new* to him who never heard it. But "God has spoken by the mouth of all *his* holy prophets, of the restitution of *all* things."

Cannot "you reason with Universalists, unless you throw away the whole Bible?" Verily, we are of the same mind, if you would support the modern doctrine of endless wretchedness! The Scriptures contain too much testimony in favour of the soul-cheering truth of man's salvation, for any one to resort to them for evidence to support a contrary sentiment. But if you will reason with them, they say, in the language of Scripture, "Come, now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord. Though your sins be as *scarlet*, they shall be as *white as snow*; though they be red like *crimson*, they shall be as *wool*." Isa. i. 18.

Was it not cruel in you to add—"For they do not hold to Scripture?" How do you know this? You may rely upon this, that we hold the Scriptures so fast, that no one can wrest them from us. And farther: We hold to the Scriptures to the confusion and disappointment of our religious opponents. We trust this lady will read and examine the faith we advocate, before she again speaks against it. We respectfully caution her, not to give heed to seducing spirits. To remember, that they who "put their trust in the Lord, *shall* be as mount Zion, *which* cannot be removed; but abideth for ever."

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

The increase and distribution of the Scriptures, are, most assuredly, very laudable and praiseworthy acts. We rejoice in all things which take place, calculated to ameliorate the condition of man, increase his comforts, and extend his views of the glorious character and purposes of Deity. Bible Societies, judiciously conducted, would be productive of good. But, the Missionary mania abroad in the world, is not deserving of any praise or commendation. The American Bible Society recently celebrated their seventh anniversary, in this city. Their meeting lasted nearly *five* hours; and compliments and praises were bandied about the room, to the great comfort, we presume, of the gentlemen who shared them! It was a real time of *thanks-giving*, or giving of thanks, to each other, instead of the great *Author* of life, and light, and love! If we can believe the newspaper account of the proceed-

ings, the members are doing wonders, and thanking and praising each other at a great rate. But—

An examination of their pretensions, &c. will tell the best story of their merits and wonders. First. They say, "It [the society] has distributed the Scriptures in *every* district of our extended country, to those who are able to purchase, at an extremely moderate price; to the *poor gratuitously*." Is this declaration true? We answer, and boldly, in the face of the world, say, *no*! We appeal to the parties concerned, and ask, Have not you *refused* to give Bibles to the poor? To the temperate poor; and when told that they were destitute of the Scriptures, and *unable* to buy? We appeal to the public, and ask, Were not you given to understand, and were not means made use of, to convince you, that Bibles were to be *given, not sold*, to the *poor*? If Bibles are to be bought, there are booksellers who will sell them as *low* as the Bible Society sell their Bibles! Let facts decide. The society acknowledge the receipt, the past year, of \$45,131 25. This sum would furnish 90,000 Bibles and Testaments, for *gratuitous* distribution to the poor. How much have they given, of this \$45,131 25? Ans. On their own acknowledgment, only \$7,592 24!!! Consisting of 12,923 Bibles and Testaments; at the average price of 53 cents, and a fraction. And these 12,923 Bibles and Testaments, have "been distributed gratuitously to the *poor*, in every district of our extended country." Have they supplied all the poor?

There are 360 Auxiliary Societies, and they are named as the receivers of an indefinite number of the 12,923 Bibles and Testaments, *given to the poor*! Now, if these Auxiliary Societies have copied after the Parent Society, and *sold* their Bibles and Testaments, which they received out of this 12,923, pray, how many Bibles and Testaments have the *poor received gratuitously*, the last year? A wretched winding up of the yearly drama, this. Surely, the gentlemen praised one another for their sagacity and address, in *keeping the money*!!!

We shall say no more at present, of the Report of the American Bible Society, believing the above is as much as the public will digest at once, of an unexpected treat; but conclude by observing, that we shall leave it to the managers, to inform the public of the amount of *salaries* paid to the disinterested and benevolent servants of the institution.

"HONOUR TO WHOM HONOUR IS DUE."

DEDICATION AND INSTALLATION.

The new and elegantly finished Meeting House, erected for the Central Society of Universalists, at the corner of Bulfinch-street and Bulfinch Place, was dedicated to the service of the Most High, on Wednesday afternoon last. The services were as follows, viz. Lessons from the Scriptures. Introductory Prayer, by Br. Streeter of Portsmouth. Dedictory Prayer, by Br. Mitchell of New-York. Dedictory Address by Br. Dean. The Concluding Prayer by Br. Winchester of Vermont. Benediction by Br. Dean.

In the afternoon, Br. Paul Dean was installed

Pastor over the Society hereafter to worship in this house, incorporated as the Central Society of Universalists in Boston. Exercises as follows, viz.—Lessons from the Scriptures. Introductory Prayer, by Br. Wood, of Shrewsbury. Installation Sermon, by Br. Mitchell, of New-York. Installation Prayer, by Br. Streeter, of Portsmouth. Delivery of the Charge and Address to the Society, by Br. Turner, of Charlestown. Right-hand of Fellowship, by Br. Streeter, of Portsmouth. Concluding Prayer, by Br. Streeter, of Salem, and Benediction by Br. Dean.

The Exercises, throughout the day, were appropriate, and marked with religious solemnity. The Installation Sermon, by Br. Mitchell, was an able and argumentative discourse, and delivered in that style of energetic eloquence for which the speaker is particularly distinguished. Several select pieces of Music were performed by the Choir between the various exercises, in a masterly style. *Bost. Pap.*

From the Boston Recorder.

ATTEMPTS FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.

A writer in the Jewish Expositor, who seems to have devoted much attention to Jewish subjects, promises, under the title of "Horæ Judaicæ," to give the public the result of his reading, in a variety of detached facts, and anecdotes, reflections and inquiries.

The earliest account he has met with of preaching to the Jews, is contained in a precept of Edward the First, in the year 1281, directing the sheriffs and bailiffs, under whose care the Jews were placed, to cause them to attend the preaching of the Dominican friars. Some other hints of similar proceedings appeared in the early history of England. No accounts remain of the manner or results of this service. Probably it did more harm than good.

Gregory XIII. who became pope in 1572, issued an order enjoining the Jewish community at Rome, to send 600 men and 50 women, every Saturday evening during Lent, to hear sermons on the evidence of Christianity. These sermons were preached by one of their own Rabbies who had been a convert, "a great while." At this time the Jews dwelt by themselves at Rome, "being locked in their streets by gates on either side," the Romans every night keeping the keys. When a case of conversion occurred, it was signified by throwing away the yellow cap or hat which the Jews always wore by way of distinction, and taking a black cap or hat instead of it. Moreover, when any one became a convert, "all his riches he must then forsake," and give them over to the use of the pope. Conversions were rare. Evelyn, who was at Rome in 1615 and attended the service, says, that the Jews were constrained to sit out the hour, but it was with so much malice, humming, coughing, and motion, that it was hardly possible to hear the preacher.

Skippon was at Rome 20 years after Evelyn, and says that not only a fixed number, but one out of each family was obliged to attend this service. If any were absent whose attendance was expected, they were punished with a pecuniary mulct.

This is a fair specimen of what was done for the conversion of the Jews by the preaching of the Gospel during many centuries. Is it any wonder that their prejudices are not removed to this day?

From the (Canandaigua) Plain Truth.

FANATICISM.

"If (says a writer in the Religious Intelligencer,) Christians were not all infidels, like myself, they would certainly pay some regard to the statements which have been frequently made, that there were at the present time 6 or 800,000,000 of our fellow beings living in ignorance and sin; and that about this number are passing into eternity every thirty years, without any knowledge of the Saviour," &c. Our fanatics might as well give the devil the whole earth in fee simple, as a "snug little farm" at once, as to pay him rent at this enormous rate. Again—"On the subject of missions to the Indians, I am no longer an infidel. For I verily believe we shall see thousands of them in glory, sanctified by the gospel which Christians and others [What others? Turks and Jews?] are sending to them. * * * * and all who are understandingly opposed to missions, unless they repent, [of their opposition,] will 'be cast into outer darkness, where will be weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth.'" Here is a threat of damnation in earnest, from a poor drivelling fanatic, in the enlightened year 1823. This language, when translated, means, "Deliver your purse—or you will be damned!" A more ferocious footpad never said "stand!" to a true man.

INSTALLATION

On Wednesday last, Br. THOMAS WHITEMORE was publicly Installed as the Pastor of the "First Universalist Society, in Cambridge."

Relig. Inq.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

STANZAS.

There is a hope—a blessed hope—
More precious and more bright,
Than all the joyless mockery
The world esteems delight.

There is a star—a lovely star—
That lights the darkest gloom,
And sheds a peaceful radiance o'er
The prospect of the tomb.

There is a voice—a cheering voice—
That lifts the soul above,
Dispels distrustful anxious doubt,
And whispers, "God is love!"

That voice is heard from Calvary's height,
And speaks the soul forgiven—
That star is revelation's light—
That hope the hope of heaven.

J. T. M.

¶ We are requested to state, that the Editor of this Paper will be at White Plains, to-morrow (Sunday.) Hours of service, ten o'clock A. M. and three o'clock P. M.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1823.

NO. 4.

From the Universalist Magazine.

TO THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, IN MARLBOROUGH, VERMONT.

Brethren—I take this method to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of both your public admonitions, together with the sentence of excommunication, you have pronounced upon me. I thank you heartily for all your good intentions in dealing with your rejected brother, and deeply regret the pain an unsuccessful result may have given to benevolent dispositions.

I would gladly have come to the conclusion, that it was best to make no reply to your doings, and probably should, had it not been for a conviction, that in duty to myself, to you and the cause of truth, some things ought not to pass unnoticed, or lie before the public in their present form. And the same reasons which induce me to reply, will render it impossible to avoid the utmost freedom in my remarks, though I am not conscious of the least design to retaliate, or wound your feelings. Feeling it an act of duty to you, and justice to myself, faithfully to point out wherein I think you are wrong, I pass without further compliments to notice some expressions in those official documents I have received from you, connected with various circumstances relating to the same subject.

The first thing I shall notice, is a misrepresentation of my sentiments in the following words of the complaint: "In denying the endless punishment of the finally impenitent." This expression, if it means any thing, supposes that I believe the wicked will be made happy though not holy; that notwithstanding they remain rebels against God to all eternity, they will be made participants in the joys of the heavenly state. You very well know, that when I was before the church, I denied believing any such doctrine, and stated to you expressly that it was in a way of holiness and reconciliation to God, that I hoped and expected the final happiness of all men; that I did not believe in a salvation *in* sin, but *from* sin; and afterwards proved from the positive testimony of scripture, that the work of reconciliation would ultimately be universal. And you, then, at least your Rev. Pastor, understood my views on this subject. And that you should after this extend the abuse through all your public censures, proclaiming from the desk, repeatedly, that I believed a doctrine which you knew I did not, is what you may answer to your conscience and your God. I have no inclination to make any use of it, only to vindicate my sentiments to the public. I have therefore only to add, on this particular, that "he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which

he doeth, and there is no respect of persons with God." However, this is not all. Not only my sentiments have been misrepresented to the public, but my moral principles stand impeached by another false statement in your first admonition, which reads as follows: "And according to your own confession in being guilty of the rashness and presumption of advocating and propagating doctrines dangerous to the morals and souls of men." Was it because you had nothing on which to found this allegation, that you have forged my testimony in its favour? Was it because you had no evidence to prove to the world that it was a licentious doctrine, that you have represented me as pleading guilty to the charge? Or did you think that the charges brought against me were not sufficient to justify your proceedings, and therefore took the liberty to make such additions as seemed good in your own eyes? You very well know I never made any such confession to you, nor could I believe you intended to be so understood, though you had fully expressed it, till I found that some of your number had personally put the same story in circulation amongst my friends. I wish not to attach any blame to the innocent; but this charge, to which I plead not guilty, comes to the public by the unanimous voice of the church; I have therefore, only to say, that if the church have indeed unanimously anointed this thistle to be king over them, if they have unanimously agreed to justify their proceedings to the public by falsely charging me with the most sacrilegious abomination, then let them come and put their trust under its shadow, but remember it is a bramble which will wound the flesh, though it may possibly keep off the dogs. But if not, if they do not agree in supporting this charge, then let fire come out of the thistle and devour the cedars of Lebanon. Let them prove by a dissenting voice that they have no part nor lot in this matter. The commandment says, "thou shalt not bear false witness." Reminding you, that with the same judgment you judge, you shall be judged, and with the same measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again. I shall say no more on several expressions found in your letters which imply that when I united with you, I was insincere, that I was hypocritical, and acted the part of a deceiver. You have given me the judgment of a hypocrite, and measured to me the portion of him that lies to God, and why? Because I did not continue to be a hypocrite, because I did not continue to mock God with my vain pretensions, and deceive my brethren by professing what I did not possess. If I had persisted in it, you would still have welcomed me to your bosom;

but the moment I forsook that course, you doomed me to perdition. Now, admitting I was as hypocritical as you suppose me to have been, will you seriously say, that it was wrong for me to throw off the mask and become an honest man, to repent of such wickedness, and forsake it? And on the other hand, allowing I was sincere in my professions, does it prove I was not sincerely wrong? And will you say, that God requires his creatures to continue in the wrong because they have once engaged in it? Do you believe he would accept of any excuse which could be offered in vindication of such conduct? Suppose I should come before God, and say, Lord, I am sensible I am in the wrong, I am conscious I am acting a base part, and going in direct opposition to thy requirements; but I am determined to persist in it, for I once covenanted to do so. I once vowed to God and man that I would pursue this course, and now I am determined to sacrifice my conscience, every principle of righteousness, and all the duties I owe to thee and to my fellow men, and put at defiance all thy commands, to support that promise which I rashly made. I then thought it was right, but am now satisfied it is wrong; but I will not, I may not forsake it, because thou hast my promise that I would not. Would not this come home like a two edged sword, "Who hath required this at your hand? Hath the Lord more delight in sacrifices than in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." You say I have no right to pursue that course which scripture and conscience dictate, because I once promised to do otherwise. What is this but making void the commands of God by your tradition? What is this but commanding all people, nations, and languages to fall down and worship the image you have set up, on pain of being cast alive into the burning fiery furnace of hell? I am not careful to answer you in this matter, for the God whom I serve is able to deliver me from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver me. But be that as it may, be it known unto you, I will not serve your gods, nor worship the image you have set up. And besides, if you condemn me as a covenant breaker, by what course of reasoning will you justify yourselves? Did you not once covenant with me, and with God on my account, as much as I covenanted with you? By what authority then have you disannulled that covenant, and cast me out of the church? You say, perhaps, that you have a reason which will justify you in it; so I say I have a reason which will justify the course I have pursued; but for acting upon that reason you condemn me; and do you not then give sentence against yourselves? The Lord judge between me and you, and reward every man according to his works. I suppose you thought God was willing to have the connexion dissolved, or you never would have presumed to do it in his name. I suppose you were willing, as you profess to be governed by the will of God. I believe God was willing, and I know I was. If, then, the parties are all agreed, where is the blame? Who is aggrieved by it? Who has any cause to complain?

But, after all, I deny that I ever made a covenant with you that placed me in the situation you represent. One promise which I made in that covenant and which summed up all the rest, was, "That I would at all times, by aid of God's grace yield myself to be his willing and obedient subject, sacredly keep all his commandments, and walk in the statutes and ordinances of the Lord blameless." That this promise recognizes, as my right, nay, as my duty to reject whatever in your faith or practice, is contrary to the doctrines of heaven, will be admitted by every rational and candid man. And if it did not, you must acknowledge that covenant is what it should not be, for whether to obey God or man, is a question which was long since decided. Where then, is that flagrant violation of covenant vows so much complained of? If you have not received for doctrines the commandments of men which you are determined to support at every hazard, I see nothing to prevent your saying with the apostle, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind, to his own master he standeth or falleth." If you have no more right to say what are the doctrines and precepts of heaven, than I have, then you have no right, on the strength of that covenant, to condemn me for disagreeing with you. Does it not intimate a wrong spirit in yourselves so to do? Is not the language of such conduct, We are the people, and wisdom dwells with us? Look at an expression which comes to me in your name, and see if it does not corroborate this idea: "By becoming a blind leader of the blind." What does this imply? Why, certainly, that you see, but we do not, and therefore you treat us with contempt. However, I forbear to make remarks on any thing which manifests a spirit so much like that which actuated the Pharisee, when he stood by himself, and prayed thus: "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men, or even as this poor publican." (Universalist.) I only submit for your consideration the words of our Saviour. St. John ix. "And Jesus said, for judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind. And some of the Pharisees which were with him, heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, if ye were blind ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth." On your own ground judge for yourselves, whose situation is most dangerous, yours or mine. The blind leaders of the blind, of whom the Saviour speaks, were the Pharisees, who said, We see; we have all the true light there is in the world; not the poor ignorant publicans whom they despise; and if this is not the case now, what meaneth this bleating of the sheep, and this lowing of the oxen which I hear? I am sure Amalek is not destroyed.

These being some of the circumstances under which your admonitions came to me, you need not be greatly surprised that they had so little effect on my mind. However, you are pleased to impute it to a different cause. You say, "It is in vain we reason with you, &c. so long as your heart is shielded against the truth, with a fixed determina-

tion to pursue your own chosen way." But by what right do you say it? I told you I only waited to be convinced of my fault, and I was ready to acknowledge it. But instead of endeavouring to convince me, you came before the public and declared I was determined I would not be convinced. How do you know? You never tried to convince me. You have never produced one scrap of evidence to prove that my doctrine is not true, and that my practice as a preacher is not scriptural. You say, indeed, that my doctrine is demoralizing, and that my practice is unscriptural; but why did you not bring forward the evidence which proved it so, before you presumed I would not be convinced? You say, too, in so many words, that I pervert the Scriptures. But how do you know that? Have you ever heard me pervert the Scriptures? When I was called before you, I produced a few of those Scriptures which, to my understanding, revealed the doctrine of Universal Salvation in the most plain, and direct language. I produced no passage of Scripture that needed any explanation to accommodate it to my purpose, nor did I offer any explanations. I told you simply for what purpose I quoted them, and what I understood by them; and I then called on you repeatedly to tell me wherein I misunderstood them, and to inform me what they did mean, and to what I might apply them, if I did not now understand and apply them correctly. But I received no answer. I also informed you, that I had made the same request to the brethren who had dealt with me in private, and had received for answer, that they must frankly acknowledge they were *mysteries* to them, that they did not understand them, that they did not know what they did mean; and you gave no intimation that you understood them better than they did. But yet you called on me publicly to disbelieve them, and finally, excommunicated me because I did not. And not only so, but some of the brethren immediately after that church meeting, observed, that if their Rev. Pastor had got to answer the questions then put to him and the church, he ought to be in his study very quick; and these very brethren, who had this view of the subject, gave their voice in that *unanimous vote* that I should be admonished for believing that doctrine which they thought would be very difficult for their minister to disprove. Thus you have the amount of proof which you made against me. I cannot believe there is a text in the whole Bible, more applicable to the church in Marlborough, than that in Isaiah xxvi. 17, 18. "Like as a woman with child that draweth near the time of her delivery, is in pain, and crieth out in her pangs, so have we been in thy sight, O Lord. We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind, we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth, neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen." Instead of arguments drawn from reason and Scripture, to convince and reclaim me, I find nothing but the most visionary appeals to passion, which cannot have the weight of a feather in the mind of a rational man. Let us approach one of these monsters of terror with the light of truth, and

see whether it will not flee to the abodes of darkness from whence it came. You call on me to "look forward to the awful day of accounts, when I must give up an account of my *stewardship*, and see the blood of souls which will be required at my hand." What do you mean by this? Do you mean to take the ground of the slothful servant, and seriously charge God with reaping where he had not sowed, taking up that which he has not laid down, and requiring that which he has not given? You have all along denied that I have any *stewardship*, that I have ever been employed by the head of the church to labour in his vineyard, that I ever had the care of souls intrusted to me. But now, you tell me, I must answer for that which I never had, that God will call on me to give an account of that which he never intrusted to me, that if immortal souls are lost, I must answer it at my peril, though he never committed them to my care. Did God require of the prophet any but those over whom he had made him a watchman? Was it a true prophet or a false one, of whom God said, he would require the blood (not of immortal souls, but) of the house of Israel? Was it he that was actually a steward, and had his master's goods put into his hands, that was called upon to render an account of them; or was it some other man, who had never received a farthing? But on what principle is this awful account to be made up? You say it is this: He that never received one talent will have to answer for the improvement of five, ten, or more. If the prophet Jeremiah were now upon earth, and I should ask him, how any idea so absurd, so wonderful, so horrible, was ever received or supported by a professed Christian church, could he give a more pertinent reason than is expressed in the 5th chapter of his prophecy; "The prophets (says he) prophesy falsely, and the priests bare rule by their means, and my people love to have it so," submit to it, and acquiesce in it; and with what propriety does he ask, "What will ye do in the end thereof?" Your preachers tell you, that the number of the elect is definite, that it cannot be altered, increased, nor diminished; that God will save his chosen few in spite of men and devils; and then they will tell you in the next breath, that now there is an opportunity for you to secure your salvation; but if you are a little negligent, if you are inattentive to it, your chance will soon be over, and then you are lost eternally. And so long have these absurdities been palmed upon you as truth, that you now tell us (for ought I know seriously) that I am ruining immortal souls, those very souls, whom God from all eternity, predestinated to eternal life: (for you surely will not charge me with ruining the reprobates whom God has decreed to endless wrath.) If there is any consistency in such doctrine, it is out of my sight. But I forbear to dwell longer on this side of the subject. Before I close, I feel it my privilege, gratefully to acknowledge your kind intentions in delivering me over to the visible kingdom of satan, which was, you say, for the destruction of my fleshly and corrupt principles and practices, that my spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, which

authorizes me to believe that you never would have done as you have, had you not supposed that my holiness and final salvation depended more on the kingdom of Satan than on the kingdom of Christ. It is as much as to say, If you had remained in the visible Kingdom of Christ, you would, in all probability, have filled up the measure of your iniquity, and become a vessel of wrath fitted for destruction; but by the purifying nature of the satanic kingdom and influence, there is some reason to believe you will be purged and come forth as gold seven times purified. To a fate so mercifully designed, I submit without a murmur, commending myself and you to him who hath the residue of the spirit, knowing that he can make the wrath of man praise him, and will restrain the remainder; and that he will "destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth, for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Then the breach shall be healed, peace shall be restored to man, and we shall mingle together the joys of immortal blessedness in the kingdom of our Father. HUBBARD H. WINCHESTER.

REMARKS ON THE NEW HEAVEN AND NEW EARTH.

Our last Number contained the conclusion of Br. Kneeland's Sermon, on Rev. xx. 10. On reading it, we were impressed with a conviction that Br. Kneeland would extend his views a little farther, on deliberately considering the subject of the "New heaven and new earth." Knowing that a difference of opinion, and the frank expression of that opinion, will be far from giving umbrage to Br. K., we proceed to give our view of the subject. In our last Number, p. 18, col. 2. Br. K. says,

"Many more of a similar nature might be quoted, if it were deemed necessary, to establish the point for which we are now contending; which is, that the whole of this book has relation to the events of time; and some have even gone so far as to suppose that all its representations have been fulfilled. To this latter idea, however, I am not prepared to subscribe; for no event which has yet taken place can in any sense answer to the description given of the *new heaven*, and the *new earth*: not that I think there will ever be a new earth, literally, much less a new heaven, but something that will answer more fully to the description given in this book than any thing which has yet been experienced by mortals."

To be brief, we ask, What was the *old heaven* and the *old earth*? Br. K. will not admit the idea of a *literal* understanding, of the subject. Consequently, that which is to answer to the description given in this book, must not be *literal*. Was not the old heaven, the *Jewish Church worship*? And

the old earth, the *Jewish rule and dominion*? If so, then the old heaven and the old earth are gone; to use John's words, "no place was found for them." Now we consider that no interregnum happened. The new heaven and new earth, immediately took place of the old. For proof, see Isa. lxx. 17, 18. "For behold, I create *new heavens* and a *new earth*; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." The new heaven, then, and the new Jerusalem, are one. The new rule and dominion, and new earth, are one. But we have a more extensive sense, which points to the time, or age, in the new earth. The old earth was, emphatically, the old earthly man, Adam, who was from the earth. The second Adam was the Lord from heaven. Man is now *created*, in Christ Jesus, unto good works. Here is a new earth, or new rule and dominion; Christ reigning where sin and death reigned in the old earth.

Paul had his eye upon this, and cherished these views, we think, when he declared, to the Galatians, (iv. 26.) "Jerusalem, which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all." To the Hebrews, (xii. 22, 23,) "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," &c. Quere. How could Paul and his compeers be said to have (in the past tense,) *come* unto "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," if the city has not come to this day, but is yet *future*? John says, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away!" They were gone! "And I John saw the holy city, *new Jerusalem*, [the same that Paul came unto, unless there are *two*,] coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne, said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done." The declaration of Christ to the woman of Samaria, is of the same import—John iv. 20—24, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." Surely, the *mind* of the believer is the place, where the new Jerusalem

is to be found. It is there that God dwells. There is his tabernacle.

Again. Brother K., page 19. col. 1. says,—“Instead of looking forward, therefore, to the day, when *whosoever is not found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire*, with dread, and fearful apprehension, I hail it as one of the most joyful eras recorded in all the sacred volume. Then will be brought to pass the truth of the following testimony, (ch. xxi. ver. 3.) “Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they will be his people, and God himself will be with them, and be their God; and he will wipe away all tears from their eyes, and death will be no more; for the former things are passed away.”

Now we respond, with John, and say, “IT IS DONE!” Christ declares—“He that liveth and believeth in me, shall *never die*.” There is no more death to the believer; “for the former things are passed away.” The old Jerusalem was a Pharisaical workshop; where every one *laboured* to save himself, and damn his neighbour. The new Jerusalem is a temple of rest. The work is done. The old earth was full of the pollutions of sin and death. The new earth, purged by the High Priest of our profession, is quickened into life, and light, and love. Tears are wiped away. The eye, no longer dimmed with the rain of despondency, is fixed on life and immortality, and sees, by faith, the accomplishment of all the promises, securing the restoration of all mankind.

It is, perhaps, a common mistake with mankind generally, like the Jews of old, to look for visible and material things, on which to place their eyes, and find an object of *sight*, instead of *faith*. They were astonished at the idea, which they considered was expressed by Christ, of giving them his *flesh* to eat. But Christ declared, “The *flesh* profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit*, and they are life.” The reign, kingdom, dominion, rule and government of Christ, is spiritual. The holy city, or new Jerusalem, is spiritual also. So long as man is blind, sits in darkness, and in the prison house, he is ignorant of the new Jerusalem. It is when Christ opens his eyes, bursts the doors of his mental prison, and frees the prisoner from his dark abode, that he sees the glory of God, and beholds the light of the holy city, the new Jerusalem. How emphatic is the description! “I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.” The temples built by men, and sanctified with imprecations and threatenings, are fit emblems of the mental prison, whose walls are washed with the waves of “the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone!”

From the Christian Intelligencer.

UNIVERSALISM ON A DEATH BED.

DEAR BROTHER,—In your last epistle you informed me of the death of two of your kind and esteemed friends* in Portland, members of your so-

ciety. As I began to read this clause of your letter, gloomy thoughts ran through my mind. Ah! cruel death! thou king of terrors! Two more have fallen at thy hand, while others stand, and mourn, and weep. But, my mind was not long pained with such gloomy reflections. Your declaration that “they remained, to the last moment of life, firm and unshaken in their FAITH in the Universal Saviour,” called my mind from this dismal scene of death and darkness, to the bright scene of glorious life beyond the tomb, where death can never come, and supplied me with two or more powerful testimonies against the assertion, often unjustly and tauntingly made, that a *belief in the doctrine of the Universal goodness and salvation of God, will not give support in a dying hour*.

Those who make this assertion use their utmost endeavours, when occasion offers, to make the assertion true. Great exertions are often made to alarm and to terrify the sick, who profess to believe that Christ will prove to be, *virtually*, what the Father sent him to be, viz. “the Saviour of the world.” But, in all such cases with which I have been acquainted, as well as in the case you mention, these exertions have proved ineffectual. Though it has been said, that the approach of death would cause them to give up their faith, yet death, together with all these pious exertions, have not been able to destroy their confidence in the crucified and risen Saviour, who, they believed, is “the propitiation for their sins, and *not* for theirs *only*, but ALSO for the sins of the *whole world*.”

A case of this kind lately occurred in Sidney. A young lady, by the name of Lucinda Taylor, aged about 20, died a few weeks since, triumphant in the faith of the gospel, through which life and immortality are brought to light for the dying family of man. She found, by happy experience, that *this faith* was good to live by in time of prosperity, that it was good in days of great distress, and good in her dying moments.

A year ago she was brought to endure several months of extremely distressful sickness, during which it was sometimes thought, by herself and friends, that life would continue but a few hours longer. At such times, as well as during her whole sickness, professors of religion were trying, both by persuasion, and by the most horrid denunciations, to induce her to renounce her faith. On one evening, in particular, when it was not expected that she would continue until morning, one of her visiting neighbours told her, the probability was, that she had but a little while to live; and, if she did not change her belief, she would sink to hell! After I had heard of these things from several others, they were told me by Miss Taylor herself, who recovered her health so that she has since visited this town. “These anathemas of men,” said she, “did not move me. I was confident that my Saviour was sufficient for me; and I *knew*, that those who were constantly endeavouring to disturb my rest, knew nothing of my doctrine.”

As winter again came on, consumption renewed its hold on this daughter of Zion; and, as though

* Capt. Prichard and Mrs. Smith.

the greatest distress of body were not enough, several of her neighbours again renewed their efforts to distress her mind. I visited her during this, her last sickness; and, though she viewed death near, her rest in the Lord was glorious. That heavenly calmness and serenity marked her conversation, which is rarely found.

I inquired whether any were yet exerting themselves, as they had done before, to shake her confidence in the impartial and never-failing Saviour of sinners. "Yes," she replied, "many continue their endeavours; but their exertions to weaken, rather tend to strengthen my faith. The more they say, the more I am led to look to Jesus; and I behold more and more beauties in him. I feel that I am safe in my Saviour's arms."

In this rest she continued to the last, "being sealed with the spirit of promise," and joyfully expecting "the redemption of the [whole] purchased possession," of him "who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." So I suppose that those who were her "miserable comforters," have, in their thoughts, sentenced her to ceaseless woe. Of this I judge from the assertions before-mentioned. What must she have done to give them ground to hope for her future welfare? She must have assented to their creed. She must have expressed a conviction that there is an endless hell for the greater part of sinners, and a Saviour but for few; and that she, according to an eternal decree of God, was to be of the happy few. Then they could have thought that "all is well." But not to make a Christ of experience, nor trust in assenting to a certain creed; but to trust implicitly in the Son of God, and believe that he is the unchangeing and never-failing friend and Saviour of the whole human family, was thought sufficient to cast one off for ever—from the mercy of God. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

S. COBB.

Waterville, Feb. 25, 1823.

From the (Baltimore) Telegraph.
EXCOMMUNICATION.

Our readers will doubtless remember the account we gave a few days ago of the excommunication of a lady from the "pale" of a church in New-York. Since that we have seen many able remarks on the subject from various quarters of the Union, but none has pleased us better than the following article from the pen of Mr. NILES, the Editor of the Baltimore Weekly Register. We copy it entire; and, in doing so, we beg our readers to understand that we are the decided opponents of religious intolerance. It might possibly happen, that if we knew the entire cause of Mrs. Townsend's wish to withdraw from her church, we should differ from her in opinion; and we venture to say, we do differ therefrom. But does this difference of opinion make her a criminal worthy of *excommunication* from the church? The idea is ridiculous. In this blessed land of liberty we have a liberty of conscience which *dare not*, and cannot be infringed upon—if we choose to be orthodox, it is our *right*—if we

choose to remain steadfast in our belief, we have a right to do so. If our neighbour entertains principles of heterodoxy, it is *his* business, and not *ours*; but it would be impertinent in us (to say the least,) to attempt to wrest from him, by a silly excommunication, the account he keeps with *his* God, when we have enough to do to attend to the mending of *our own ways*. We do not like this spirit of persecution, which we occasionally see springing up among those very people who *profess* Christian charity and love. If we enjoy a light superior to that of our brethren, let us convince them of the fact, by showing them *love and charity*; but if they are in error, for which they are accountable *only* to the Most High and Omnipotent, we cannot devise better means to render that error permanent, than by denunciation and excommunication.

We do not like an over-anxious desire to make converts to particular sects, let the clergy and the laity, in their *individual* capacities, give evidence of a "Christian walk;" and a knowledge of their sincerity will make more converts to true religion, than all the excommunications and denunciations which they may "jointly and severally" manufacture and publish.

"THE HOLY INQUISITION."

Mrs. Maria Townsend, of New-York, being a member of a certain religious congregation in that city, requested permission to *withdraw* therefrom, on account of her disbelief in some of the doctrines held forth in that church. Her request was not granted, but she was cited to appear before some set of persons to answer for her disbelief; she declined it. A committee was then appointed to visit her: she remained steadfast in her opinions, and defended them in a manner that was satisfactory to her own mind. The committee reported on her case; but, instead of suffering her to retire in a peaceable way, it was resolved that she should be publicly *excommunicated* "on the ensuing Lord's day, in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ." This was done; and the priest, in performing the service, said: "It has become my painful duty to announce, that Mrs. Maria Townsend, a member of this church, has, for two years past, persevered in denying the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and has presented her children for dedication, at that place of *pretended* worship, where the doctrine is taught that the *wicked* will be saved as well as the *righteous*."

Who gave this man authority to pronounce such condemnation on his neighbours? It is the language of "the holy inquisition;" and should cause *him* to be "excommunicated" from the society of all liberal and just men.

The lady thus roughly used, or some one for her, it seems to me, has a natural, if not a legal right, to satisfaction for this rude prosecution, and public exposure. Circumstanced as she was, it was her *duty* to retire from the congregation; and there is no law of God or man recognized in this country to prevent or molest her for doing so, in an orderly manner; yet she was trumpeted forth as if having committed a *crime*, and thundered at from the pulpit, by

name! The day of such things has passed by, and I hope that this lady will prosecute the priest for *defamation of character*. If the law will sustain the action, there is no doubt that a jury would award such damages as might reduce the priest to a short allowance of wine, at six or eight dollars per gallon; and make him think well of the matter before he should again become the agent of an assault on the reputation of an unoffending female, pursuing what her own conscience told her was her duty to her God. Disagreeing with the doctrines or dogmas of the church, she ought to have retired from its communion, as she wished to do; and this was sufficient. The law gives to no one the right of *abusing* another for a difference in religious opinion in the United States; and it must needs then either be prohibited by the law, or reserved for settlement by the law of force, the law of nature, to punish offences; and the priest ought to be held responsible in his property or *person*, if not in both. A black coat should no more protect a man in doing wrong than a blue one; we know that it may as easily cover a black heart, as the other (being the dress of a soldier,) envelope a cruel one. It is innocent and good deeds only that should defend a man, and these are as "a hedge set round about him." Priest are like the rest of us, good and bad; and, as the very worst and meanest of us, should be held here, as they will be held hereafter, accountable for their conduct.

Every religious sect, or other association, has an undoubted right to prescribe the terms on which new members shall be received, if consistent with the laws of the land; but, give up the point in the case of this harmless lady, and the principle of "the holy inquisition" is at once established. There is only one religious denomination, of any considerable extent, that we know of, in what is called the Christian world, that confines its members to persons of mature age; and at least ninety-nine out of every hundred of those attached to other sects became so by acts not their own; by the doings of their parents, and a course of instruction over which they had no sort of control. If these, when they begin to feel that they are responsible beings, and, as such, bound to think for themselves, and do their own work, cannot subscribe to what the *priest* says is orthodox, shall they be abused for it, persecuted and proclaimed? In what does this differ from the fiery persecutions of queen Mary's reign, or the diabolical proceedings of the priests of Spain, in the time of Philip the Second? It is true that, blessed be God, they do not now roast people alive to convert them to Christianity; but a submission to the proceedings in the case of Mrs. Townsend, would go to suffer private reputation to be assailed as it was in the days of Philip, and permit denunciations as to a future state, by imprudent mortals, affecting to govern the Almighty will, or assuming a knowledge of it, in matters of *conscience*! This will not do. The society in question ought to have been relieved of the membership of the lady, and she solicited leave to retire. There was nothing against her but a difference of *opinion*—she had not otherwise offended—and it was her *unalienable* right to withdraw

from any sect and associate herself with another, at her own discretion. Had she not given notice of her intentions she might have been justly expelled; because every society has some needful surveillance over its members, and may compel their attendance, &c. or relieve itself of them: but the liberty to withdraw from any one, in a case of conscience like this, cannot be refused, unless we are willing to allow the establishment of a tyranny, which, in its nature and operation, is the most cruel and remorseless of all: insatiate as death, and as cold as the grave.

We have not mentioned the name of the sect, or that of its clergyman, in this case, for we have not any thing to do with either of them. It is the great principles of religious liberty that we contend for; and we repeat our wish, that a prosecution may be instituted for *defamation of character*, that the law may be settled. If there is no law to punish such proceedings, recourse must be had to the law of nature, or natural law, which was thus described by the late venerable Dr. Tilton, of Delaware, in 1775, in reference to the then existing state of our country, struggling for freedom. Speaking of the "carting" of a tory, he says—"You cannot be ignorant that the law of the land is insufficient to protect us against the violence of Great-Britain, and that, therefore, America has recurred to the law of nature, by virtue of which she has strengthened her hands. As we have no law of the land by which we can punish tories and traitors, the natural law of necessity takes place—and the question in C.'s case is, Did he receive more than he deserved?" Again he says—"What recourse then had America left? Why, she appealed to the law of nature,"* &c.

When we had written thus far, and folded up the article for the compositor, as being finished, the following accidentally presented itself, on looking over the papers lying on the desk for another subject. It is extracted from Graham's Descriptive Sketches of Vermont, and so appropriate to what we have been speaking of, that we cannot refrain from inserting it. The spirit manifested is such as no liberal man can condemn, though the act itself might have went too far; still it is an excellent story, and believed to be a true one; and will furnish amusement to most persons who have not before seen it.

"The farmer, in question, was a plain, pious man, regular in the discharge of his duty both to God and his neighbour; but, unluckily, he happened to live near one with whom he was not inclined to cultivate either civil or friendly terms. This troublesome personage was no other than a monstrous overgrown he-bear, that descended from the mountains, trod down and destroyed the cornfields, and carried off whatever he laid his paws upon. The plundered sufferer watched him in vain, the ferocious and cunning animal ever finding methods to elude his utmost vigilance; and, at last, it had learned its cue so thoroughly, as only to commit its depredations on the Lord's day, when it knew, from experience, the coast was clear. Wearied out with

* Principles and Acts of the Revolution, p. 259.

these oft repeated trespasses, the good man resolved, on the next Sunday, to stay in the fields, where, with his gun, he concealed himself. The bear came, according to custom; he fired, and shot him dead. The explosion threw the whole congregation (for it was about the hour of the people's assembling to worship,) into consternation. The cause was inquired into. As soon as the pastor, deacons and elders, became acquainted with it, they called a special meeting of the church, and cited their offending brother before them; to show cause, if any he had, why he should not be excommunicated out of Christ's Church, for his daring impiety. In vain did he urge, from the Scriptures themselves, that it was lawful to do good on the Sabbath day. He was cited before judges determined to condemn him; and the righteous parson, elders and church, *viva voce*, agreed to drive him out from amongst them, as polluted and accursed. Accordingly he was enjoined (as it is customary on such occasions) on the next Sunday, to attend his excommunication in the church. He did attend—but not entirely satisfied with the justice of the sentence, and too much of a soldier to be scandalized in so public a manner for an action which he conceived to be his duty, he resolved to have recourse to stratagem; he, therefore, went to the appointment with his gun loaded with a brace of balls, his sword and cartridge box by his side, and his knapsack on his back, with six days' provision in it.

Service was about half over when he entered the sanctuary. He marched leisurely into a corner and took his position. As soon as the benediction was ended, the holy parson began his excommunication; but scarce had he pronounced the words "offending brother," when the honest veteran cocked and levelled his weapon of destruction, at the same time crying out with a loud voice, "Proceed if you dare—proceed and you are a dead man!" At this unexpected attack, the astonished clergyman shrunk behind his desk, and his opponent, with great deliberation recovered his arms. Some moments elapsed before the parson had courage to peep from his ecclesiastical battery; when finding the old hero had come to a rest, he tremblingly reached the order to the elder deacon, desiring him to read it. The deacon with stammering accents and eyes starting with affright, began as he was commanded, but no sooner had he done so, than the devoted victim again levelled his piece, and more vehemently than before exclaimed, "Desist and march—I will not live with shame—desist and march, I say, or you are all dead men!" Little need had he to repeat his threats—the man of God leaped from his desk and escaped; the deacon, elders, and congregation, followed in equal trepidation; the greatest confusion prevailed, the women with shrieks and cries, sought their homes, and the victor was left undisturbed master of the field, and of the church, too, the doors of which he calmly locked; put the keys in his pocket and sent them with his respects to the pastor. He then marched home with all the honours of war, lived thirteen years afterwards, and died a brother in full commu-

nion; declaring to the last, (among his inmates) that he never tasted so great a dainty before."

NEW CHURCH.

For the gratification of our friends abroad, we inform them that a House for the public worship of Almighty God, will be erected in this city the ensuing summer, to be designated by the name of "The First Universalist Church." The house will be erected on the south side of the Court House square, to be built of brick, proportion, 70 feet by 60, and it is expected that the house will be completed by the first of December next. *Hart. Rel. Inq.*

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"Boast not thyself of to-morrow, for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." Solomon.

Boast not, vain man, although to-day
Is pleasant and serene;
To-morrow's sun may chase away
Thy prospects like a dream:
Boast not, for though the day is fair,
To-morrow thou may'st see
Thyself a victim to despair,
A child of misery.

Is wealth thy boast, and canst thou say,
"I've riches vast in store;
And still, I'll gather every day,
And hoard up thousands more?"
Boast not—to-morrow thou may'st see
Thy riches fly away,
Thyself reduced to penury
In one short fleeting day.

Is fame thy boast, and does thy name
Resound from shore to shore?
Does the re-echoing trump of fame
Recount thy actions o'er?
Boast not—it is but for an hour,
To-morrow's luckless day
The clouds may o'er thy prospects lower,
Thy fame may pass away.

Are friends thy boast; do they appear
To make thy cares their own?
And do they vow to be sincere,
Though adverse fortunes frown?
Boast not—for friends are fickle things;
When wealth and fame are gone,
Then friendship soars on eagle wings
"And leaves the wretch to mourn."

Or dost thou boast, that length of years
Are treasured up for thee;
That thou shalt wear the hoary hairs
Of life's declivity?
Boast not—for, O! how many flowers
Have bloom'd at morning tide!
And yet before pale evening's hours
Have wither'd, and they died.

And now vain man, as thou must know
That nothing here is sure,
That all is but a fleeting show,
That all is insecure;
O, then, to Heaven thy views extend,
There cast thy eyes above,
There dwell thy Saviour and thy Friend,
Thy God—the GOD OF LOVE. E.S.G.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1823.

NO. 5.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Paterson, (N. J.) May 26, 1823.

SIR,—Having understood that the Rev. William Parkinson, of New-York, was to preach at the Academy in this place yesterday morning, I, with others, attended. The text which he selected, was Luke iv. 32. "And they were astonished at his doctrine, for his word was with power." After having spoken for some length of time, he advanced, in substance, the following—"Arminians boast of preaching free grace; but their free grace is like the free grace of a merchant taylor, who keeps clothes for sale: you are free to go and provide yourselves with as many suits as you please, but you would find that he expected you to pay for them. Now this is a fair sample of Arminian free grace. The grace of God, say they, is free for all who will perform certain conditions. While the Scriptures represent man as dead, blind and lame; so that they cannot perform those conditions." After expatiating for some time on this subject, he proceeded thus—"The Universalist says, that at the resurrection all men shall be raised, and taken to heaven. But Christ says, All that are in their graves shall hear his voice: all shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation. And he says, concerning the wicked, these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. You know the Universalists quibble here, to try to make *everlasting* mean something different from *eternal*; but the learned among them know better; they know they are deceiving the people; and they know the original word is the same in both cases." And he concluded, by exhorting the audience to beware of this dangerous doctrine.

With such words as these, and a profuse quantity of *burning lakes* and *endless flames*, he succeeded in working upon the feelings of some of the female part of the congregation, so as to cause them to shed tears, and vent sighs, as though their hearts were filled with direful apprehensions of the wrath of God; which he assured them was ready to burst upon their heads, and hurl them to never-ending misery. When Christ gave commission to his apostles to preach, it was to preach the *gospel*; which the apostle to the Galatians, Chap. iii. 8, assures us, is blessedness for the nations in Christ. This man, in common with many (alas! too many) others, who profess to be preachers of the gospel of Christ, in the stead of teaching that *God is Love*, seems to endeavour to impress upon the minds of his hearers, that God is *hatred*. And, in the stead

of proclaiming, *Glad tidings of great joy*, which shall be to *all* people, they are promulgating *sad* tidings of endless *misery* to all, save an elect few. His talents, as a preacher, I consider as above the common rank; and therefore conclude he could not be ignorant that Universalists do not pretend to say there is a difference in the meaning of the words *everlasting* and *eternal*. With these remarks, and a fervent desire that he, with all others, may be turned from the worship of the *beast*, to the service of the living God, I take my leave.

A HEARER.

NOTE.—The writer of the above has left his name, which will be made known to Mr. P., if requested. We subscribe to the opinion expressed by our correspondent, that Mr. P. could not be ignorant of the fact, that Universalists not only admit, but contend, that the words in the original, rendered *eternal* and *everlasting*, are the *same*. If Mr. P. makes this declaration again, the public will estimate his integrity correctly, and award him the demerit which will be the proper recompense for *deception*.

ED.

THE VOICE OF THE GREAT BEAST,

STYLED

"A warning from Heaven to all vile sinners upon earth."

A pamphlet of eight pages, octavo, was published, not long since, in New-Jersey, with the above title, by the revival-raisers, to convert sinners to their god. The Bible, we presume, and reason and common sense were thought to be insufficient. The time of the happening of the wonderful event is carried back to an age, and located in a country, so very distant, that the deception is well calculated to pass current with the simple and unwary. It appears that "In the town of Govert, thirteen miles southwest of Gloucester, (Eng.) lately lived the Rev. Mr. Thomas Chamberlain," &c. How lately? Why, the account says, in the "month of September, 1718," he "was taken in a trance, and lay several hours." During this trance, the account says, the reverend gentleman's "soul as it were had taken its flight into another world; he was kindly saluted by the same person who had warned him of his death," &c. (He had previously been notified.) After taking a short look at heaven, and being assured that he should die and go there the next Sabbath,—"Now, said the holy angel, you shall see the state of the damned, and all that do not make their peace with God. Then, taking me down the hill, he bid me look on the left hand, where I had a most dreadful prospect of the bottomless pit *burning*

with fire and brimstone, which put me into a great trembling, because I saw a *great many devils* on the first bank thereof, some of which offered to catch me; but the angel bid me take courage, for they could not hurt me; and, looking a little more earnestly on them, I perceived that they were chained, which gave me some new assurance. Behold, had you heard the cries of the damned, and seen their torments, you would never dare to sin, nor offend God any more," &c.

This account of *hell*, with many high coloured particulars, was given by the reverend gentleman the next Sabbath, from his pulpit, having his shroud and coffin on the spot. After a long discourse, of what was said to him by the angel, the account says the angel addressed him as follows—"Depart now, thou holy man; be thou the messenger of this, and make known to the inhabitants of the earth, the Lord hath found thee righteous in his sight; be faithful unto death, and thou shalt have a crown of life; for, on the thirteenth day of the month, and ninth hour of the day, thou shalt be with the Lord, and receive the reward of *"Come, ye blessed of the Lord."*"

It is in this enlightened age, that a part of the community, calling themselves Christians, publish *falsehood*, and circulate it to convert sinners! This bundle of *lies*, is dated "*Teiksbury, (N. J.) July 6, 1821.*" On the last page is some rhyme, entitled "Christian Experience," from which we extract the following—

"Mixtures of joy and trouble I daily do pass through;
Sometimes I'm in a valley sinking down with wo,
Sometimes I am exalted, on eagles' wings I fly,
I rise above my troubles, and hope to reach the sky.

"Sometimes I'm full of doubting, and think I have no grace,
Sometimes I'm full of praying, when Christ reveals his face;
Sometimes my hope is little, I think I'll throw it by,
Sometimes it seems sufficient if I were call'd to die."

We presume the publishers of this pamphlet wish to "raise a *revival*," and make Christians of their own stamp. Convert men with *fire and brimstone*! They have, though unwittingly, given a true portrait of themselves, when they say,

"Sometimes I'm full of doubting, and think I have no grace."

Again. This hope looks like the hope of the *hypocrite*, and proves their faith to be rotten.—

"Sometimes my hope is little, I think I'll throw it by."

Of the Christians, who, on their own confession, are "*full of doubting*, and think they have no grace," and who talk of *throwing their hopes away*, we think they had better raise a revival among themselves; and, if they cannot make their fire and brimstone publications answer, (they have given them a fair trial,) try the Bible and common sense!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

SIR,—The following passage of Scripture I submit for your consideration, hoping it may find a

place in your valuable paper, together with an exposition, giving its meaning. John v. 28, 29.

By attending to the above request, you will oblige a subscriber. E. P. A.

June 1, 1823.

JOHN v. 28, 29.

Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.

This passage has been discussed in our former volumes. However, as it is a subject of much importance, and it is probable this may meet the inspection of many persons who will not have an opportunity to read our former expositions of this passage, it will be proper to consider it briefly.

The principal difficulties which are presented to the mind, on reading this passage, are the following—First—Those who become the recipients of the *damnation* spoken of, cannot be saved. Second—It disproves the doctrine of the salvation of all men, because it designates a period for the execution of the sentence, posterior to this life, and after the general resurrection and judgment. Now, if these objections were real, being founded on Scripture, reason, and fact, we should no longer advocate the reverse. But this is not the case. Examine the connexion. Verse 25. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and *they that hear shall live.*" This was in the present tense. It must be admitted, that those spoken of as *dead*, were those who were *dead in sin*. Otherwise, it supposes a conversion after the death of the body, which our friends in opposition do not relish. Were these *dead sinners in the graves*? We answer, Yes. For Christ, ver. 28, adds, "*Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming; in the which all that are in the [not their] graves shall hear his voice.*" It appears that, at the time, only a *part* of those in the graves heard; but the time, or hour, was coming, when *all* who were in the graves should hear, &c. We insist upon this distinction in the tenses. Keep your eye upon this. When did the hour last mentioned arrive? Ans. See Dan. x. 14. "Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people [the Jews,] in the latter days; [not in another world,] for the vision *is for days.*" [Not for eternity.] The Spirit continues his instructions to the prophet, to chap. xii. at the 1st and 2d verses of which we read as follows—"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince [Christ,] which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Christ (Matt. xxiv. 15, 21,) quotes Daniel, as follows—"When ye therefore shall see the abomination of

* The reverend gentleman having told his story, died in his pulpit, and was put into his coffin and buried the same evening. So the account says!

desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand.) For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." The language is highly figurative in both passages. The dust of the earth, and the graves, denote the blindness of men, and the darkness of their minds.

The resurrection, literally, is a coming forth, or casting out of the dead. In the literal resurrection spoken of by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. the dead are raised incorruptible, immortal, and glorious. But, in this figurative language of the passage under consideration, those that are in the graves come forth to a resurrection, not in a resurrection. Christ says, "*I am the resurrection and the life,*" &c. The hour is coming—When? Ans. At the destruction of the Jewish Church and worship. Then Christ was manifested in his kingdom. Man slept no more, but came out of the dark grave of ignorance to a knowledge of Christ the resurrection. They who do good, believe on him, have the life of the age, and rejoice. They who come to the knowledge of Christ's triumphant death and glory, and do not believe, are—*damned*. Ah! How do you know this? Why, the book says so. We deny it. The book says no such thing. By consulting Rev. xiv. 6, 7, you will learn that the *judgment* of God, and the preaching of the gospel, (or coming out of the graves,) were simultaneous. And by consulting an *honest* commentator, or the Greek Testament, you will find that the same word, to an accent, is rendered *judgment* in Rev. xiv. 7, that is rendered *damnation* in John v. 29. How came the translators to make this difference? That is more than we can tell. You are welcome to a conjecture, reader, and it is this—They could not make their favourite damnation agree with the connexion in Rev. xiv. 7, for to call upon men to give *glory* to God, because the hour of his *damnation* is come, would be shocking language. In John v. 29, however, they had an opportunity to do as they pleased; and the consequence is, that men are *damned* by the translators, when their Saviour only *judged* them. His judgment is *merciful*. It was left for the holy parson to consign men to an *endless hell*!

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

SERMON

Delivered at Bernardston, (Mass.) Oct. 29, 1822, at the funeral of a child (an only son,) of Mr. Joseph Pickett. By John Brooks.

INTRODUCTION.

The following discourse was hastily prepared for the occasion on which it was delivered, and involves considerations, respecting infants, which are not explained. The author believes our whole earthly nature to be a body of sin, and that obedience to its propensities constitutes one a sinner. But, "sin is not imputed where there is no law;" and law is what designates those inclinations and acts which are sinful. "Where there is no law (let there be ever so much sin,) there is no transgression." There is,

and can be, no law in the mind of a child, until it becomes capable of understanding. Therefore, until that period, it is innocent, although, if it had corporeal powers, it should even murder. What is meant by law in the mind, is conscience, which is acquired by experience and cultivation. The best conscience is produced by that law which is most perfect; which, with Christians, is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself." The excellency of this law constitutes the excellency of our religion; and when it shall be established in every mind and heart, and not till then, will the world be saved. For this we preach the gospel; and those who receive and obey it, are without condemnation. THE AUTHOR.

SERMON.

MATTHEW XVIII. 10.

Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that, in heaven, their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

The little ones, spoken of in the text, are either little children, or adult persons, who, in their tempers and dispositions, resemble little children. Christ, in several instances, and in the most affecting manner, manifested his regard for little children: he took them in his arms and blessed them, &c. He declared to his hearers, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." This is sufficient to show, that the moral state of little children is that which comports with heaven, and the most perfect blessedness. If this be the case, the opinion of some people that little children are liable to the "wrath of God, and the pains of hell for ever," must be erroneous. This opinion appears to be opposed, not only to what Christ said respecting them as above quoted, but to numerous other representations of Scripture. By the prophet Ezekiel God has expressly declared, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Ezek. xviii. Therefore, seeing a child has the iniquity of no one but itself to bear, if it has not iniquity of its own, it is innocent. Until a child becomes capable of understanding the moral law, it cannot be guilty of any infringement of that law. A child is, therefore, as innocent as the angels in heaven, and is precisely in the same moral state: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

The Scriptures uniformly state, that every person is, and shall be, rewarded according to his works. And what works has a child, of but a few days old, performed? Has it done, or neglected to do, those works for which some "go away into everlasting punishment," and others "into life eternal?" Think ye that Christ ever said, or ever will say, to such little children, "I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat, &c."? or, "I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat, &c." and place them on his right hand or left, for eternity, in consideration of their good or

bad conduct in this respect? No one can suppose little children to be capable of this attention to, or neglect of, Christ, or of those whom he denominated his brethren. Such little children, therefore, are subjects neither of rewards nor punishments. Nevertheless we have Christ's authority for considering them the subjects of heaven and happiness—"Of such is the kingdom of heaven.—Their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." If this view of the case be just, one very important consequence presents itself, viz. If little children are heirs of immortality, with all its concomitant blessings, then immortality, and those unfading joys, are not conferred according to works, but of the free grace of God. That little children are heirs of immortality, is as certain as that any of the human race are; "for, as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." "For the creature (or creation) itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption," 1 Cor. xv. Rom. viii. Children then, at least, are an exception to the doctrine which teaches that happiness or misery, in the immortal state, are the reward of deeds done in this mortal life. If immortality, and its unspeakable and endless joys, depended on the deeds of this life, not a child, which dies before it becomes capable of moral action, could inherit them. Thanks to our gracious God, this is not the case. Immortality and eternal life are the gift of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; or, in other words, through the resurrection. As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom *he will*. As the Father hath life in himself, so hath *he given* to the Son to have life in himself. Neither the Son, nor any other being, can have this life but as it is imparted from God; for he alone hath immortality. As God hath given to the Son to have life in himself, (by conferring upon him his own immortality,) so hath he given to the whole human family, in due time, to have life in the Son; for "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." See Eph. i. 10. and 1 Cor. xv. 22, 28. Observe, respecting the last verse referred to, the object of Christ's reign is stated to be "that *God may be all in all*." God is immortality; and, therefore, for him to be *all in all*, is to impart immortality to all. Hence our Saviour quotes the declaration, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," to prove the resurrection from the dead; for "God (i. e. immortality) is not the God (or portion) of the dead, but of the living." See Luke xx. 37, 38. "All live unto him;" i. e. to immortality. This is the resurrection from the dead, which is promised to all men; and hence, "we shall not all sleep, but *we shall all be changed*. For the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*." But I am getting aside from the immediate objects I had in view.

The text informs us, that the angels of little children do always behold the face of God. There may, perhaps, be some query what is meant here by the word angels. Some persons have been led to suppose that every individual of the human race has

an angel appointed over him, to watch his goings, and to minister unto him. They have supposed that good persons are thus guarded by good angels, and bad persons by bad angels. When Christ was upon earth, manifest in the flesh, and for a long time previous and subsequent to that date, the opinion prevailed, that the spirits of the dead entered the living, and ruled over their minds. These supposed spirits, whether good or bad, are what are called demons, or devils, in the New-Testament. What truth there is in this hypothesis, I pretend not to determine; but as it respects the angels mentioned in the text, it appears to me most probable they are spirits inherently belonging to the persons spoken of. Christ speaks of the fact that the angels of little children do always behold the face of God, as though it were a great privilege and blessing to them. Whereas, if those angels were foreign and distinct beings from the children themselves, it is not easily perceived how it could be a matter of particular interest or concern to them. The expression of Christ, "*Their* angels," seems to imply that they were not other beings, but the property of the children of whom he spoke. Probably the same thing is meant by this expression; "The Spirit beareth witness with our own *spirit*," &c. Rom. viii. 17. *Our spirits, and their angels*, seem to be of the same signification. In this light I shall consider the text, and proceed to show—

1. The necessary moral condition which a person must be in, in order that his spirit may behold the face of God.

2. The condition which hinders this privilege, or enjoyment.

3. The blessedness which flows from the enjoyment of this privilege.

First—I propose to consider the moral condition which is necessary, in order that one's spirit may behold the face of God. This we may understand by considering and comparing different portions of Scripture upon the subject. We learn from our text, and parallel passages of scripture, that little children are in the moral condition requisite. We learn that this is their uniform, invariable state. Christ not only says their spirits behold the face of God, but they do *always* behold his face. There is not a moment in their whole existence when they are in moral darkness, filled with doubts and fears. There is not a moment in which they indulge the tormenting apprehensions which are generated by false and forbidding ideas of the character of their Maker. Their angels, or spirits, behold our Father in heaven as he really is, without those false colourings which erring mortals have fixed on his character. In beholding God, therefore, they behold the purest moral light, the sweetest life, the most endearing love. What then is their moral condition, by which they enjoy this happy privilege? Answer, It is innocence; a state of innocence and purity of heart. Hence says Christ, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Considering this declaration in connexion with our text, we must conclude that little children are pure in heart. If it be necessary to possess a pure heart in order to

see God, then, as our Saviour has declared that the angels, or spirits, of little children do always behold his face, it follows, that little children are always pure in heart. This, therefore, is the moral state which it is necessary to be in, in order to see God; that is, to see him as he is, stripped of those revengeful, frightful characteristics, which have dishonoured his name. To be in this state, is to be in a state congenial with perfect love, which is God. Perfect love, therefore, casteth out fear, and filleth the soul with blessedness. Blessed are they who are converted from the errors of a false doctrine, from the delusions and superstitions of the world, and have become as little children, having a taste and relish for the sincere milk of the word; the word of eternal life, the word of peace, of salvation, yea, blessed are the pure in heart, for they, like the angels of little ones, shall see God. The eternal Spirit will thus witness with their spirits that they are the children of God; and, if children then heirs, heirs of God, &c.—heirs with Christ, of immortality.

Secondly—I am to consider the moral condition which hinders the enjoyment of the privilege mentioned in the text. As we learn from the text that the innocent, harmless, pure spirits of little children do always behold the face of God, we conclude that adult persons, by some means or other, come to be actuated and governed by different spirits, and to possess impure hearts, and are thereby prevented from beholding the face of their Father in heaven. As all those persons were once those harmless, inoffensive, pure-hearted little children, some sad change must have taken place to transform them into characters so entirely different. If they were *naturally* possessed of that moral purity which I have described, they are now converted into something which is against nature. St. Paul speaks of certain odious characters, who, he says, were “without natural affection;” and, being without natural affection, he describes them as being implacable and revengeful. Natural affection will spontaneously fix itself on every kindred and lovely object; and, as all mankind are brothers, natural affection will embrace them all as such. When a person, therefore, is divested of this natural affection, he will then love none of the human race but himself; and even his love for himself will be a false unnatural love: false and unnatural, because it will seek its own individual good at the expense of the kindred family of man, in which way it can never be found. It was this want of natural affection, this false love, which induced Cain to rise up against his brother and shed his blood. And it was because Cain, by such means, became metamorphosed into a being so entirely different from what is natural, so different from what we may see in a little child, that he considered not only his fellow-being, but God himself, as his enemy. Being at enmity with his own nature, he exclaimed, “It shall come to pass that every one that findeth me shall slay me.” Being also at enmity with God, he exclaimed, “From thy face shall I be hid,” &c. Now, it is as natural to love God, as it is for a child to

love its parent; and hence have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us? When ye pray, say, “Our Father which art in heaven.” If God be our father, if he be the father of the spirits of all flesh, then, truly, all mankind are his children; and, as his children, why not love, why not reverence and adore him? Is it not because we are without natural affections? Is it not because, Cain-like, we have become estranged from God, our Father, and also, from our brethren? Being thus estranged, being thus perverted from our very natures, being thus deteriorated from what we were as little children, being thus impure in heart, and actuated by an evil temper, spirit, and disposition, we are ready, with Cain, to suppose every man’s hand against us, and that God, our unchangeable Creator, is our enemy. “He that hateth his brother is a murderer,” and the murderer, the unnatural monster who would shed a brother’s blood, must always be in the same condition as the unhappy Cain, crying, “Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid, and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me.” How different the moral condition of such an one from that of a little child, or from that of him who is converted, and has become as a little child! While *that*, being divested of natural affection, loving neither his Father in heaven, nor his brother on earth, is thus flying from the terrors of his own haunted imagination, the horrors of his own guilty conscience, and viewing himself as a fugitive and vagabond in the earth, hid from the face of divine love, from the face of God; while *that* is in this awful, this seemingly insupportable state, *this*, this little child, or this believer and follower of Jesus, who has been converted to his natural state and become as a little child, looks with smiles of complacency and love upon all his fellow-beings, upon all the bright and glorious works of God. He traces, with satisfaction, with delight, the infinite wisdom and beneficence of his Creator, in the countless objects which present themselves in the vast volume of nature. He rejoices in all that he sees, in all that he contemplates, as flowing from his Maker’s hand, and, under all the allotments of divine Providence, he is calm, serene, and composed, believing (and that is sufficient) that “the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” In short, in this moral state, with these just views of God and his moral government, their angels do always behold the face of their Father in heaven.

Thirdly—I am to consider the blessedness which flows from this source. Our Saviour would never have said, respecting little children, what he did in our text, if it had not been important. He never spent words on trifling subjects. We may, therefore, suppose it is an exalted privilege to have our spirits behold, and especially always to behold, the face of our Father in heaven. Indeed we are authorized from his language to consider this a blessed state. He declares, “Blessed are the pure in heart.” Wherefore? “For they shall see God”—

they shall enjoy what is always the portion of little innocent children. This blessedness is that, after which saints, in every age, aspire. Job exclaims, "I know that my Redeemer liveth—and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." "As for me (saith David) I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Again—"One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." The strong desires of Job, and of David, to realize what is always enjoyed by the spirits of little children, are sufficiently manifest in the above quotations. The desires of David were to see the beauty of the Lord in his sanctuary—to see the beauty of the Lord by the eye of faith, or spiritually. It is in this sense that we behold the glory and beauty of our Maker as in the face of Jesus Christ. All that can be imagined of moral excellency, glory, and beauty, is to be found in that divine spirit which constitutes Christ in the heart, filling the soul with love, peace, and joy. In a state of conversion, when we have become as little children, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and, if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, to an inheritance that is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Rom. viii. 17. and 1 Peter i. 4. As heirs of God, we are heirs of all moral perfection and beauty. The same spirit which is the source, author, and cause of all moral perfection, is the author of all the order and beauty of nature. The spirit of the Lord garnished the heavens; and, in the visible creation we behold a type of the adorable Divinity. Do we then, with admiration and awe, view and contemplate the amazing structure of nature? How much more shall we admire, how much more shall we revere the invisible, the infinite, the incomprehensible Author! What are the heavens, with all their shining hosts; the sparkling worlds, which are travelling their rounds through the vast regions of space, with all their splendour, with all their grandeur, majesty and beauty, in comparison with him whose all-pervading, all-powerful energy gave them form and motion, and continually suspends them in his invisible hand! The ponderous universe his matchless power sustains.

"His wisdom guides the rushing wind,

"Or tips the bolt with flame;

"His goodness breathes in every breeze,

"And warms in every beam."

God is immutable; God is eternal. His attributes are the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. "The heavens shall decay and wax old," for all material things are mutable; but God is the same, and his years have no end. Remember this—God is unchangeable. If the angels, the spirits of innocent beings, did ever behold his face with delight, it will be the same for ever. We find a thousand objects, in the material creation, which delight our eyes and please our fancy; but how soon their beauties are gone, and gone for ever! The lily of the

valley spreads its bosom to the sun, its delicate tints excite our attention, our wonder. But how soon the lily droops! how soon its lustre vanishes! how soon its fragrance dies! Nor is even man, the noblest work of God, with all his attractive perfections, possessed of unchangeable existence. He appears an infant of days, a youth of a few years, a man of one or two scores, or a decrepid creature of three score years and ten, and his ephemeral existence is ended. He is gone. The silent grave encloses him; he dissolves into his original elements, and no voice issues from the tomb to reveal the secrets of the unseen state! The Scriptures alone come, with welcome accents, to our ears, and inform us, that if man dies, he shall live again: that he shall live again, because the immortal, the unchangeable God is his God, and "he is not the God of the dead but of the living." They, therefore, who deny the resurrection of the dead "do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." Yes, my friends, the grave, though it must embrace, in its cold relentless arms, this frame, which is so fearfully and wonderfully made," cannot always boast its victory. Once has its power been overcome: Jesus rose triumphant. He lives; and "because he lives we shall live also." He is "the first fruits of them that slept"—"the first-born of every creature." Therefore "we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," 2 Cor. v. 1. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible," 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. "This (saith Christ,) is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day." John vi. 39.

Thus we have God for our Father, Christ for our resurrection, life and immortality for our portion, and heaven for our home. "And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new," Rev. xxi. 4, 5, (compared with Isa. xxv. 7, 8.) Believing this, our angels, like those of little children, do always behold the face of our Father who is in heaven.—Amen.

N. B. An extemporaneous address to the mourners, which followed the foregoing sermon, is omitted.

The following is a letter from a gentleman to his friend, accompanying two volumes written by Dr. Joseph Young, &c. This letter points, with much precision, to some of the most prominent causes of the antichristian practices of the present day, and indicates much liberality of sentiment, and independence of mind in the writer.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

New-York, May 14th, 1823.

TO MR. *****

Agreeably to your assent, and my promise, I have transmitted to you, for your perusal, two books written by Doct. Joseph Young, late of this city, on

the subject of *Universal* salvation. In placing these volumes before you, I wish to have it explicitly understood, that their contents are not to be regarded as my religious creed. Not that I think the opinions and sentiments they contain are calculated to dishonour any person; on the contrary, I believe they bear evidence of the real character of their author; for if more than twenty year's intimate acquaintance with him, qualified me to judge rightly, he had a strong, active, reflecting, inquisitive and logical mind. No man, perhaps, was more indefatigably studious, few more learned, and none more honest, honourable, humane and benevolent, or who took greater pleasure in doing good to his fellow beings. Yet I have never known that human being, however learned and honest, whose religious opinions I would be willing to adopt *en masse*. If I have but one talent, I will endeavour to cultivate *that*, and abide the result, in preference to being led blindfolded by the *ten-talented* Doctors of Law, Physic, or Divinity, or any one else, however actually or reputedly learned.

Allow me further to remark, that in putting the accompanying books into your hands, I am not influenced by a desire that you should change your religious opinions. It is no concern of mine whether you believe in future punishments or not, or whether future punishment will be eternal or temporary, so long as those opinions are not accompanied with any *immoral acts* against my equal rights, or those of others. All mankind agree that there are different degrees of crimes, and that *strict justice* in regard to crime and punishment, consists in correctly apportioning the latter to the former. So long as we are found to act on this principle of justice towards each other, none have a right to complain. It is therefore very foolish and impolitic, if I may not say *wicked*, for mankind to dispute and quarrel about a question, which they have neither the *right* nor the *means* of settling, viz. Whether in a future state of existence, God will, in coincidence with the only rule of justice of which mankind have any knowledge, in the case before us, apportion the quantum of punishment to the degree of crimes respectively, or whether he will punish *alike* the child who steals a cake, and those impious bigots, who in the name of an immaculate, just, and merciful God, commit slander, persecution, rapine, cruelty, and murder on their fellow beings, for dissenting from religious tenets by which those crimes are instigated and excused! All religious sects admit that there is not any *mercy* in eternal punishment—all allow (and some without heeding its incongruity) that *infinite mercy ends where endless torment begins!* The advocates of such punishment call it *justice!* Punishment without *mercy*, is *unmerciful* punishment; and if there could be such a principle, or such a *virtue as justice*, as applied to punishment without *mercy*, it would indeed be *unmerciful justice!* What a paradox! And yet systems of religion are built on it, and whole congregations, no less honest and intelligent than others, for disbelieving it, are treated with as much severity as if abusing them was serving God!

The spirit of proselytism is produced by an *excess* of religious zeal, and I always regard it with a jealous and scrutinizing eye. It is a restless, busy, intermeddling, presumptuous, officious spirit, and leads its possessors too often to concern themselves so much about the religious opinions of others, as intirely to overlook the absurdity of their own. It is so intent on the attainment of its primary object, that the character of the means by which its purpose is effected, is sometimes but very little, if at all regarded. It will use argument and persuasion in the absence of physical power; give it the latter, and it will *act by force*. Hence it is that the spirit of proselytism vested with political power, is immediately transformed into that spirit of persecution which has crimsoned the soil of *civilized* nations with human gore, and made their history but little more than a catalogue of human crimes and miseries. How wise, how prudent, how just, nay, how *pious* then was it, in the framers of the American constitutions of political government, to withhold from religious zeal, the carnal weapons of political power, and leave it to combat error with reason and argument, its only righteous means of warfare! Those who would use other means than these, are too ignorant to be teachers, or too dishonest to be trusted.

But if the contents of the accompanying volumes are not to be regarded as my religious creed, nor the reading of them intended (by me) to enlighten your understanding, and induce you to embrace the doctrine they espouse, why are they, (you will probably ask) tendered for your perusal? It is that you may know the real opinions and doctrines of an intelligent and learned Universalist, and also some of the reasons, arguments, and texts of scripture on which that doctrine is founded. *That* may possibly be useful to you, inasmuch as you will at least be more correctly informed on those subjects; when you hear the Universalists detail the reasons and evidences of their faith, than when you hear them second-hand from those who either do not know them, or may have an *interest* in making them appear to disadvantage. While the customs and manners of civilized society inspire mankind with an inordinate love of money, and preaching is made a *cash article*, and people make a profit, nay, gain a livelihood by dealing in it, there never will be wanting those who will *take an interest* in keeping alive those sectarian prejudices and distinctions, which are among the means of enabling many to live without labour on the avails of the honest industry of the pious portion of the community. It is often the case, and is true as it relates to religious opinions, that mankind differ *most* when they understand each other *least*.—While the different sects are induced to avoid intercourse with each other, and are led to turn a deaf ear to what they have to say for themselves respectively, prejudices are easily engendered, as easily kept alive, and are too often actively employed to injure each other and benefit the cunning and designing, both in church and state. Should the members of the various sects habituate themselves to associate more familiarly with each other than they have been

taught to do, attend with patience and candour to hear and learn the opinions of each from their respective advocates; and reason, reflect and judge for themselves, they will probably find that a great portion of the opinions which each have entertained to the disadvantage of the others, have resulted from mistake, prejudice, or misrepresentation. This discovery will naturally dispose them to exercise more charity, liberality and benevolence towards each other, than they have been accustomed to do, and incline them more to follow the example of God, who bears, and forbears with them all, however different or inconsistent their religious creeds, or erroneous their estimate of the doctrines of each other, or however weak, foolish, or presumptuous they may be, in threatening each other with his *wrath*, and imploring the *vengeance* of a God of *infinite love and mercy*, on the devoted heads of those no weaker and no more wicked than themselves!

Charity, liberality, and benevolence among the numerous religious sects, by the means suggested, or some other, producing the like salutary effects, must be inculcated and practised, before a religion of "Peace on earth and good will towards men," can reasonably be expected to prevail, and exhibit throughout the habitable globe, that state of human felicity, ardently desired by every philanthropic and benevolent mind, and which bigotry, superstition, intolerance, and cupidity, under the assumed name of Religion, have too long, and too successfully conspired to prevent.

With much esteem, and not less of good will,
I am, Yours, &c. T. H.

MR. SAURIN'S VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL MISERY.

After having preached a lengthy discourse, to prove the truth of the doctrine of endless misery, he observes thus, "I sink, I sink under the awful weight of my subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations, the people of my charge, this whole congregation; when I think, that I, that you, that we are all threatened with these torments, when I see in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the levity of my resolutions and designs, the least evidence, though it be only presumptive, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a mortal poison, which diffuseth itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter. I cease to wonder that the fear of hell hath made some mad, and others melancholy."

Rel. Inq.

ANOTHER CONVERSION IN THE MINISTRY.

The Rev. Mr. Belfour, who has been for several years a Baptist minister in Charlestown, Mass. has recently become a Universalist. On the last Sabbath morning, he made an avowal of his sentiments to his congregation. The friends of Universal Grace and Salvation, cannot but be thankful for this valuable acquisition to the number of those who proclaim eternal life, sure in Christ Jesus, for all man-

kind. Mr. Belfour, is the learned author of the Letters to Professor Stewart, which appeared some time since in the Universalist Magazine, signed "An Inquirer after Truth." *Univer. Mag.*

"SILLY WOMEN."

"We are particularly pleased (says the editor of the Montreal Register) with a feature in one of the resolutions of the society, which we feel ourselves bound to notice. It is the appointment of LADIES to the office of collector. The beneficial effects has been proved," &c. He is right. Women have been duped by the clergy in all ages and countries. In British India they are burned alive to make a Brahmin's holiday. *Plain Truth.*

A SCRAP.

New way of exciting Repentance.

The preachers in Spain, particularly the friars, have introduced the practice of producing pictures in their sermons, to aid their eloquence. A friar having expatiated on the torments of hell, with all the ardour possible, nods to some attendants to bring the picture, which exhibited some devils running red and sharp irons into sinners. These devils are painted with horns, claws, and serpentine tails; the reverend father holds a lighted torch before the picture, that it may be the better seen by the people, and with the most hideous vociferation denounces everlasting torments to the unrepenting, like those the painter has here expressed. *Her. Sal.*

CERTAINTY OF DEATH.

Amidst the busy scenes of life

Death's fatal arrows fly;

A darling child, a husband, wife,
Is summon'd now to die.

The crimson vanishes the cheek,

The lustre from the eye;

'Tis death! our tender life-strings break,—
No parley—we must die!

What anguish fixes in the soul!

What grief and sorrow nigh!

No mortal art can fate control—

'Tis fix'd, and we must die.

Spare but a year, a month, a day,

The friend so dear, so nigh;

No, no, 'tis death, there's no delay,

Prepare, you now must die!

Well death, thy conquest make;

Thy victim take and fly;

My Saviour comes! thy bands shall break!—

Now death, thou too must die!

I'll ransom from thy fatal power,

O, grave! thy prisoners dear!—

They rest in hope of that blest hour;—

That blissful hour is near.—Hosea xiii, 14.

The foregoing effusion accompanied the Sermon published in this Number.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1829.

NO. 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I wish you to give your ideas of the Parable contained in Matthew xiii. 47 to 50 verses, inclusive. In so doing you will much oblige a candid inquirer after Gospel Truth. Yours,
Hunter, April 20, 1823.

MATTHEW XIII. 47-50.

"Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that is cast into the sea, and gathereth of every kind. Which, when it was full they drew to shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world, the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just. And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

It is admitted, of necessity, by all denominations, that this passage is a parable. The kingdom of heaven is not a net containing fishes of every kind, but is like unto a net, &c. The kingdom of heaven, is a kingdom or reign, in contradistinction to the Jewish kingdom, or worship. "So shall it be at the end of the world." The time is specified when the kingdom of heaven should be manifested, and the manner of its manifestation is declared. The figure used is emphatically descriptive. A net encloses fish so that they cannot escape. When the kingdom of heaven was manifested, at the destruction of the Jewish temple and worship, those spoken of, the Jews, were enclosed in Jerusalem, as in a net, from which they could not escape. They were gathered of every kind; but the kinds were comprehended in the two descriptions of good and bad, in the parable; and at the time of its accomplishment, in the two characters of wicked and just. The wicked Jews were sufferers, as a consequence of their obstinacy. The just believers in Christ, were delivered.

We have no hesitation in saying, that the parables of our Saviour would be stripped of much of their present obscurity, were the translation uniformly correct. We read, "So shall it be at the end of the world." Ninety-nine out of a hundred would suppose that the *material* world was here intended. That the time spoken of, was the end of all sublunary things, the end of time, as generally considered, and the introduction to a supposed day of judgment, when congregated worlds shall be assembled in the presence of their Maker to receive their final doom. So much for error and priest-craft. How, then, shall this passage be understood? We answer,—Just as it is expressed in the original, taking the translators' own definition, in other parts, for a guide. For they sometimes were correct,

when necessity, or the absence of prejudice permitted them to be so. In Heb. ix. 26. "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "The foundation of the world, *κοσμον*: but *now* [not at a future age] once in the end of the world *αυτων* hath he appeared," &c. In Col. i. 26. "The mystery which hath been hid from ages *αιωνων* and from generations, but *now* is made manifest to his saints." Now turn to the parable under consideration. "So shall it be at the end of the world, *αυτων*. What world? Answer, Paul, Heb. ix. 26. And for a definition of the word rendered *world*, ask our translators, Col. i. 26, where they have been correct in their translation!

If there is a man under heaven, who can render a reason for, and produce an argument in favour of, this corrupt translation, which misleads and torments the minds of men, we should be glad to hear it! And if there is a man living, among the orthodox, who disputes or questions our statements, we invite him to occupy these columns in defence of his own opinion, and to confute our declarations. We shall only add—We regret that our opponents' sincerity does not bear some proportion to their wilful ignorance and obstinacy.

From the Religious Inquirer.

Mr. Editor—During the last session of the Supreme court in this city, I called in to witness the trial of some of those unfortunate beings, whose crimes had brought them before the bar of justice. One poor being who approached near to idiocy, was brought forward on a charge of burglary; and as the acts charged were admitted by the counsel for the prisoner, I listened with attention to the plea that should be made in his defence. I confess I was much pleased with the learned ingenuity and eloquence of the gentlemen who were counsel for the prisoners. The principles which they laid down, and urged as the ground on which their client should be acquitted, were undoubtedly correct; but in admitting their correctness, my mind was necessarily led to the inquiry—Will not this reasoning apply in spiritual, as well as temporal things? If so, the thought struck me, that these gentlemen's reasoning at the bar, was probably at variance with their religious sentiments; and the principles on which they relied for the acquittal of their client, if admitted in their religious system, would sap its very foundation, and prove it false.

One gentleman, in addressing the jury, stated, That all punishment was intended to effect one of

two ends, or purposes. First—As an example to deter others from the commission of crime; or, Secondly—For the correction of the offender. He then directed the attention of the jury to the prisoner, and asked the question—Whether the punishment of such a man, could be an example to the community—or, whether punishment could operate on that poor being as a correction? If not, it were worse than useless to punish. Now, as all law, both of God and man, is, or ought to be founded on reason and justice, all punishment connected with the divine law, must be for the same ends and purposes, viz. either to hold up an example, for the purpose of deterring others from crimes, or the emendation or correction of the offender.

Admitting this just principle in law, we will inquire, whether endless misery, or punishment, can effect either of their ends? First—Can endless punishment be considered an example, deterring others from the commission of crime? The answer is—No. For in order for punishment to operate as an example, it must be inflicted where the crime is committed, and where those to be deterred can have ocular demonstration of the punishment. According to the Calvinistic theory, the crime is committed in this world, but is punished in another, far out of the reach of our sight, and beyond the reach of our knowledge; nor shall we see or know any thing about it until it is too late to have any effect, as an example. It cannot be believed, that the example of punishment will be necessary to prevent the commission of crimes in another world. For the saved being assimilated to the divine nature, and made like unto God, cannot have that disposition to sin, that will require the force of example, to prevent their committing crimes.

Secondly—Can endless punishment effect the emendation or correction of the offender? The answer again is—No. It would be an absurdity to say, that punishment corrected or amended the punished, and yet continue to punish him through all eternity. If, then, the law of God is as just and reasonable as the laws of man, endless punishment cannot be true, as it cannot effect either of these purposes—example or correction.

The other gentleman, in behalf of the prisoner, observed to the jury, that the law could not punish the act, or crime, but the motive which produced the act. For instance—an idiot, or a lunatic, might commit homicide, but could not be punished as a murderer, because he possessed not that moral capacity to distinguish between right and wrong; and so very slight the difference, that it was very often difficult to determine how far a man was guilty. If the gentleman's reasoning was correct, which is readily admitted, and men are only punishable according to the capacity they have of distinguishing between right and wrong, this reasoning applied to religious theory, must at once destroy the idea of the infinite nature of sin. The infinite nature of sin, has been attempted to be proved, from the dignity or perfection of the law, which requires perfect obedience; or from the dignity of the character of the Lawgiver. But if the above reasoning may be

used in divinity, all these attempts to prove *sin infinite* fall to the ground, as sin must be measured by the mental capacity of the subject, not by the perfection of the law, nor the dignity of the Lawgiver.

The honourable judge gave support to this mode of reasoning, in giving the case to the jury. He laid down as law, that all crimes committed by persons under seven years of age, were not punishable by law. Because the law considered all under that age as not possessed of that moral capacity necessary to distinguish between right and wrong; from seven to fourteen it was doubtful whether they were, or were not possessed of that capacity. The counsel for the defendant might therefore urge, that they were not, and proof might be brought to that end, in their favour. Now, if human laws are founded on reason and justice, and experience has pronounced them wholesome, good, and wise, and every crime is measured by the capacity of the offender to discern between right and wrong, and exonerates from punishment all who are destitute of this capacity, Is it possible we can believe that the law of God is so directly opposite, that infants should be the subjects of punishment in his kingdom, and even those who have scarcely breathed the vital air, subject to eternal burnings? Yet how often has it been asserted, that myriads of children will be eternally miserable. Should you consider these remarks as worthy a place in your paper, they are at your service.

JUSTITIA.

From the Universalist Magazine.

TO THE REV. HOSEA BALLOU,

Dear Sir—During a stay at Calcutta, of four months, I became acquainted with one Rammohun Roy a native of Bengal, who I see has been noticed in the Boston papers, as intending to visit the United States this year. This person I believe has been a believer in our Scriptures this three or four years past. He is generally thought to be one of the most learned men of the age. I have some of his works by me, which I should like you to peruse at some future time, as I think they will enable you to judge of his abilities on theological subjects. I was induced to have an introduction to him before I left India, having read a controversy which he had with several of the missionaries at Serampore, which arose from a publication of his, entitled "The precepts of Jesus, a sure guide to Life and Happiness," which they endeavoured to refute—after which he wrote two Appeals to the Christian public, in defence of his precepts, which I think when you come to read, you will say are very ably executed. I thought the arguments that the missionaries brought forth in support of their belief, (especially when they refer to the trinity,) are about the weakest I ever read. As I had several of your works in my possession at this time, I forwarded them to him, and thought that they would not be uninteresting, judging from the liberal spirit that seemed to dictate all his writings; and I assure you, the next time I saw him, he appeared to be enraptured with them, as he said he had no knowledge of such liberal sentiments being so general

in the Christian world, and he appeared very grateful that there are *some* who interpret the Scriptures similar to himself.

He suggested, that if some of your writings, when translated into Hindostanne, were distributed among the natives, he thought they would do more service than all the missionaries have done since their first undertaking; and I do not think there is a person more willing or capable than himself, to promote truth at any time.

If he visits Boston, in his tour through the United States, which is more than probable, you may be sure of receiving a visit from him if you are in town. He says, the few that have been enticed over to the missionaries, are the most ignorant and of the lowest cast, who are more dissatisfied than ever, and that they would willingly retract, did the laws of these regions permit them after losing their cast; and he has also informed me for a truth, that there has not been one respectable native converted by them. I think, on your reading his few pamphlets you will be able to discover, without my informing you, that he has no belief in future punishment, but that he believes our heavenly Father has constituted a law in our nature, which makes us unable to walk in the paths of virtue, without receiving ample reward in the moral happiness that there is therein. On the other hand, we never do stray from this path, into that of vice, without receiving the consequences that spring from a guilty conscience. On conversing with him, he manifests the above sentiments in a very plain manner, which sentiments I assure you meet with as much opposition from the missionaries, as those people do in our country that entertain the same; and I am happy to say with the same good effect; for all they can say against, tends to promote it, which Rammo-hun Roy generally turns over to his advantage. Now, sir, leaving you to gain what information you can from his works, I remain yours in peace.

G. R. R.

Boston, May 13, 1823.

THE WAY TO DO BUSINESS.

On the 17th of March last, a meeting was convened in this city, and a constitution prepared, when a Society styled "*Young Men's Auxiliary Society*," was formed, &c. to aid in what is called, the cause of Missions. The Rev. Dr. Spring, of course, was present! We extract this news from a publication which is floating in the missionary current, for the good of the concern. The following is also extracted:

"MEMBERS AND DIRECTORS FOR LIFE.

The executive committee have turned their attention to this source of revenue, and find that while the American Bible Society exhibits a list of 720 ministers of the gospel, who are life members of that important institution, the United Domestic Missionary Society can yet number but twelve, of whom the following eight were constituted members for life, before the present organization of the Society took place, viz.

Rev. Gardiner Spring, by *ladies* of his congregation.

Rev. J. M. Mathews, by ladies of his congregation.

Rev. Alexander McClelland, do.

Rev. R. B. E. McLeod, do.

Rev. William W. Phillips, do.

Rev. Samuel Robinson, do.

Rev. Thomas Dewitt, do.

Rev. A. O. Stansbury, by his own subscription.

And since the present organization of the society, Rev. Thomas Dewitt, of New Hackensack, Fish-kill, Director for life, by ladies of his congregation, (2d donation.)

Rev. P. M. Whelpey, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in this city, Director for life, by ladies of his congregation.

Rev. Samuel H. Cox, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Spring-street, in this city, Director for life, by a female society of his congregation.

Rev. David Porter, Catskill, member for life, by his own subscription.

It cannot be that this limited number is owing to any want of importance in the objects of the society. These must commend themselves to every conscience that is in any degree enlightened, and certainly to every heart that can feel for those who are destitute of gospel privileges. For a development of the views of the society, in the propagation of the gospel and of the abundant reason offered for the vigorous prosecution of their plan, the committee refer to the publication now issued by them monthly. It will be seen that the moral desolation in our land is great: that the desire of thousands, unable themselves to support the ministry, are reiterated from every quarter, that the gospel may be sent to them. Their hearts are ready for its reception, and their hands open to the extent of their ability for its permanent establishment among them. Many of these calls have been answered, and ministers settled, by means of aid furnished by this society; but still the cry is continually heard from other places—Send us a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The executive committee have directed that an appeal be made to the congregations throughout our country, and particularly to the *ladies*. A gift of *thirty dollars* constitutes the person in whose behalf it is made, a member for life. Fifty dollars, a director for life. There are several hundreds of congregations to whom it will be easy to raise either of these sums. Every argument that can have been advanced in favour of making your pastors members, or directors of any society, could be urged with propriety in behalf of this."

Now, be it known unto all men, that we, without any mental reservation whatever, record the names of Messrs. *Abraham O. Stansbury*, and *David Porter*, and make honourable mention of them, as men, who, however they may differ from us in sentiment, are *honest* and sincere in, what we consider to be, error. They have, (and *shame* on those who with as great or greater means, have not) paid from their own purses their quota of cash for a purpose which they profess to consider indispensable. This looks well. "Honour to whom honour is due." But, look at this—☞ "*Rev. Gardiner Spring*, by *ladies* of

his congregation!!!” Our word for it, the husbands of some of those ladies, have an income which will fall short of *one half* of Dr. S.’s salary! Now, while their hands are in, suppose they were to pay *six dollars*, due from the Rev. Dr. for two year’s subscription to the Bible Society, which he refused to pay!! If the children of some of these priestridden ladies do not *cry for bread*, and wear their elbows out, while the *illustrious and Reverend Doctor Gardiner Spring’s* boys are smoking their cigars, and whisking their rattans, we are no prophets.

We appeal to the *head and heart* of the public. Hypocrisy has wafted on *silver* seas, with *spicy* gales, the clerical drones, and shameless beggars, already too long. We say, and demand an assent too, that *all men are brethren!* That you are commanded to “Love your *neighbour* as yourself.” That pampering proud, hypocritical clergymen, and “visiting the *widow* and the *fatherless* in their affliction,” are two things. We care not for the thunder of the modern vatican. Neither do we tremble at the winks, the nods, and the surveillance of a self-styled *holy* priesthood; and their compeers in luxury and superstition. The course which *duty* marks and points out, shall be followed; maugre all the efforts of all the honourable and dignified characters the kingdoms of this world can boast, or churches show on days of solemn grimace, or holy parade. Common sense will never assimilate with, nor authorize such proceedings—such sentiments as now pass current in the religious tabernacle, where error, dignified and honoured, presides, like the Moloch of blinded Israel; save that the fires *glow* in the *mouth* instead of the *belly* of the idol.

Let the panders of these religious spendthrifts, who cannot maintain their families with a sum which exceeds by treble the amount possessed or expended by their deluded hearers, come forward. Let them fill their mouth with *arguments*, (not execrations, threats, nor denunciations, for these would pass like the idle wind,) and answer us. Why are these things so? Why is a clergyman who professes to deny the world and its vanities, and to follow the example, and tread in the steps of the lowly Jesus, to fatten on the spoils of the *poor*? How is it, that his *nose* is turned up, and his eyes averted, at the appearance of the wholesome fare of his parishioners? That luxuries and fine houses, and the extravagant follies of the fops and dandies of modern times, wring from his poor hearers their solid cash, to support his *nabob-style*, while thousands are crying with hunger, and suffering in a state of orphanage? We repeat it—Fill your mouth with *arguments*, if you dare, in open day, and in the face of the *precepts* and *example* of *Jesus Christ*, sanction such abominable hypocrisy and deception! “He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have you in derision.”

But why so harsh, so hard, at this time, upon the clergymen? says one. Be moderate, says another. Harsh! The weapon is only fitted to the engagement. The corrupt limb to be amputated cannot be clipped with *scissors*; they will be reserved to pare and trim the bandages! Calvin roasted Serve-

tus at the stake. Our victims are not chained, but tied by the withes of their own corruption. Calvin’s fire was “made of moist green wood.” Ours of *facts*, dried with already too many years of disgraceful experience. Truths, whose coruscations brighten the atmosphere of Christendom, and are reflected with significant lustre, by the blackened clouds of error. When Calvin and Luther reared the hostile banner and bid defiance to Romish error and imposition, the suffering of the sufferer was measured by his intellect; and his vision was contracted to ken a narrow horizon. Now, the mists have disappeared. The *beast* himself is seen. Shall not a full view produce sensations as great, as last-
ing, as his *shadow*? The reformation ended in establishing, under new names and guises, the abuses it promised to destroy or remedy. Mankind are whipped with, only—the *other end of the rope*! The christian’s *hell* is heated to the same degree with the Romish *purgatory*. The same brimstone serves for fuel. The only difference exists in the manner. The Pope antedated the suffering, and damned with excommunications seasoned with *auto da fes*; while modern Popes, pass the sentence for the future, and in default of present vengeance, console themselves with the dignities and fatings which are the perquisites of the Holy Office.

“Seven hundred and twenty ministers life members of the Bible Society.” Ladies, this honour belongs to you. *Fear* is a powerful motive. The *Hell* of these gentlemen’s heating is *hot*! Will your donations stand at the helm, and carry you safely by, when your bark shall pass the narrow strait of death? Hear me, ye deluded victims of pampered dignity—One zephyr, such as escapes the *orphan’s* lips, when the breath comes warm from the grateful heart of the relieved sufferer, would trim the sails, which now will flutter, and head your vessel towards the brightest heaven. Solomon, thou wert correct. “There is no new thing under the sun.” When the *ladies* keep their husband’s money in their husband’s purses, only *two* honourable and sincere men can be found among the whole clergy, to join in the important concern. Such would have been the picture of the Bible Society clergymen, we suppose, had the ladies done nothing! But now, 720 ministers are members. *Their* salaries were too *sacred* to be broken into for this purpose. They were reserved to buy *fat beef*,—*choice wines*—*fine clothes*, &c. &c. &c.

Ye sons and daughters of penury and want, your voice can be lifted in tones of *thunder*. Raise your emaciated hands, point them first to your hovels, your beds of languishing, and hungry and naked children; and then to the life-members of Bible and missionary societies—if you have any strength left, point them once to the panders of these holy dignitaries,

From the (Cincinnati) Remembrancer.

MR. EDITOR,—In the second Number of the Remembrancer, there were a few remarks made by the former editor, in reference to the piece which I

sent for publication. In one of his remarks, he said, that my object was not to disparage the clerical office, but to condemn men for assuming titles which belong exclusively to the Deity. From this statement, some of your readers might be ready to conclude, that I did approve of the clerical office. But so far from this being the case, I condemn it just as much as I do Doctor of Divinity, Right Reverend Father in God, or even plain Reverend. Such names or titles as these, given to a certain class of men, I consider in no other light than some of those names of blasphemy, mentioned in Rev. xvii. 3, which John says the antichristian whore is full of. My object in writing these lines, is not only to condemn men for assuming titles which belong exclusively to the Deity, but also to condemn all antichristian names, titles, and offices. My object is, therefore, to disparage the clerical office. Because, on reading the word of God, I do not find that there ever was such an office in the Church of Christ. It is altogether antichristian. For it was the church of Rome that first made the distinctions of clergy and laity; and this was one of the steps of the mystery of iniquity by which the man of sin acquired such power both in church and state. The distinction being once introduced, the clergy, on every occurrence, took care to improve the respect of the lower ranks, by widening the distance between their own order and the condition of their Christian brethren. In process of time, the distinction universally prevailed of the whole Christian commonwealth into clergy and laity.

The terms are derived from two Greek words, *kleros*, which signifies lot or inheritance, and *laos*, which signifies people, multitude, or nation. The plain intention was to suggest, that the former, the pastors or clergy, (for they appropriated the term *kleros* to themselves,) were selected and contradistinguished from the multitude, as being, in the present world, by way of eminence, God's peculiar or special inheritance. It is impossible to conceive a claim in appearance more arrogant, or in reality worse founded. God is indeed in the Old Testament said to be the inheritance of the Levites, Deut. x. 9, because a determined share of the sacrifices and offerings made to God, was in part to serve them instead of an estate in land, such as was given to each of the other tribes. But, I pray you, mark the difference; no where is the tribe of Levi called God's inheritance, though that expression is repeatedly used of the whole nation. Concerning the whole Israelitish nation, Moses, who was himself a Levite, says, in an address to God, Deut. ix. 29, "They are thy people and thine inheritance, which thou broughtest out by thy mighty power." The words in the Septuagint translation deserve particular attention; because the same persons are, in the same sentence, declared to be both the *laos* and the *kleros*. What, says the canonist, at once laymen and clergy? that is certainly absurd; the characters are incompatible. Yet it did not then appear so to Moses.

When we recur to the use of the term in the New Testament, we find one passage, and but one,

wherein it is applied to persons. The passage is in the First Epistle of Peter, the fifth chapter and third verse, which is thus rendered in our version—"Neither as being lords over God's heritage, (or clergy,) but being examples to the flock." They are part of a charge given to the pastors, relating to the care of the people committed to them, who are called God's flock, which they are commanded to feed; of which they are to take the oversight, not the mastery, and to which they are to serve as patterns. The same persons, therefore, both in this and the preceding verse, are styled the flock, under the direction of God's ministers; the shepherds are also called his inheritance, over whom their pastors are commanded not to domineer. Let it be observed, then, that this distinction, so far from having a foundation in Scripture, stands in direct contradiction, both to the letter and to the sense of that unerring standard. But the distinction of the whole church into clergy and laity, being once broached, in after ages, they even improved upon their predecessors. The schoolmen (a modest race, all clergymen,) thought it was doing the laymen too much honour to derive the name from *laos*. It suited their notions better to deduce it from *laas*, *lapis*, which signifies a stone. Take for a specimen a few things advanced on this subject by some celebrated doctors, as quoted by Alstensfaig, in his *Lexicon Theologicum*,—"A clergyman signifies a learned man, scientific, skilful, full of knowledge, accomplished and intelligent. A layman, on the contrary, signifies an unlearned man, unskilful, silly, and stony. On this account, the term *laic*, or layman, may be derived from the Greek word *laas*, which in Latin is *lapis*, or a stone. And so every clerk, or clergyman, in so far as he is a clergyman, is respectable; a layman again, so far as he is such, is despicable. Clergymen also are, as a body, justly superior, and ought to have the precedency of laymen?" To the above I shall only add the sentiments of Cardinal Bona, (this is another antichristian title,) in relation to the "care that ought to be taken" by the clergy, that laymen may not be allowed to do themselves harm by studying the profounder part of Scripture, which their stupidity is utterly incapable of comprehending." He kindly mentions, at the same time, the books which he thinks they will not be the worse for, and which, therefore, they may be permitted to peruse. Concerning laymen, he says, "In them, pride, the mother of blindness, reigns, so far as respects those things which regard faith and morals. For, like idiots, they presume to explain the sacred writings, which are the most profound of all writings; and, again, when they happen to possess any external accomplishment, they despise all others, (I suppose he means that they despise the clergy,) and being thus double-minded by pride, they deservedly fall into that worst error through which they are infatuated by God, so that they know not how to discern what is good and what is evil. Wherefore, let not laymen read all the books of the Sacred Scriptures. They are not, however, to be restricted from moral and devout works, which have no difficulty, or ambiguity, or absurdity in their

translation; of which sort are sacred meditations, the histories, lives, or legends of the saints."

Thus far we have considered briefly the origin of the clerical office, and we have seen that it is not derived from Christ, but from antichrist. The church of Rome was the first inventor of the clerical office. It belongs to her of right. It is an office of her own creating; therefore let her have and enjoy every office, name, or title, which she has invented. But let no member of the church of Christ receive the mark of the beast, or envy her on account of those assuming, arrogant, haughty distinctions, or dare to follow her wicked, unscriptural and antichristian example.

But to conclude—From what I have stated, you may easily perceive that I am a declared enemy to all assumed titles, which I consider antichristian, such as, His Holiness the Pope, Cardinal, Prelate, Right Reverend Father in God, Right Reverend Bishop, Doctor of Divinity, or even plain Reverend. But from what I have said, let it never be understood that I am an enemy to a gospel ministry, as it is described in the word of God: so far from this being the case, I would just remark, that all the offices which Christ has appointed in his church, I do approve of and highly esteem. They are all appointed by the Great Head of the church, for promoting the best interests of his people; and the names and titles which he gives them are not only the most honourable, but also the most significant for pointing out the various and laborious duties to which they are called. Paul informs us that Christ gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, Eph. iv. 11. Some of these were extraordinary offices, and had no successors in office. But the only stated or standing offices in all the apostolic churches, were elders and deacons. Let it be remembered, that elder, bishop, pastor, shepherd, and overseer, were, in apostolic times, synonymous terms. Accordingly, we read, that Paul sent for the elders of the church at Ephesus, and exhorted them to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit had made them bishops, or overseers, as it is translated in our version, Acts xx. 17, 28. I shall only add, that those who are called by God to the elders' office, and who fulfil it, instead of being despised, ought to be esteemed very highly in love for their works sake. w. c.

NOTE.—The above was answered by a reverend clergyman, we presume, in amount as follows—The clergy are not ambitious of titles, but only submit to receive distinctions, &c. However, when we see clergymen's names on *brass plates*, on their own doors, preceded by the word "*Reverend*," we are disposed to think, as we cannot help thinking, that the *self-styled Reverend* gentleman is very *proud*, or very *silly*, as the case may be. The ancient pharisees were regarded as the greatest *hypocrites*; not by their enemies, but by Christ, who knew them.—It may give offence to some, but we say, that modern pharisees are as great hypocrites as their prototypes.

Men who love *money*—love *style*—love greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, *Rabbi*, (Reverend,) are—what? Ans. When Peter savoured the things that be of *men*, and not of God, Christ called him *Satan*. Therefore, when the modern Peter savours the things that be of *men*, and not the things that be of *God*, he is *Satan* also. Ed.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

THOUGHTS ON LATE OCCURRENCES.

We will suppose, if you please, that all the world, or that all America, belonged to one church, or were of one religion, as it is called. But, in my opinion, religion is practical righteousness, and neither more nor less than doing good. We will suppose, if you please, that all were Calvinists, or all Quakers. Sad experience has convinced the world long ago, what would be the consequence, and what would be the fate of those who differ from the orthodox godly Presbyterians in sentiment; or, in other words, were honest enough to *express* their sentiments.—From the people called Quakers, we might expect more lenity, forbearance, gentleness, &c. as they disclaim punishing with death, on any account; and, as they have no creed, and do not profess to take the Bible for their guide, but profess to be led and guided by the unerring Spirit of truth. Well, let them all be Quakers, or Friends. Suppose a Mr. Dean, or any other member, cannot see as some of the rest see, he is excommunicated, or anathematized, if you please. They will not kill him, but they will drive him out a fugitive and a vagabond, like Cain. If he be a poor man, none of them will employ him, none will sell him any thing, none will buy any thing from him; they will have nothing to do with him, nothing to say to him; if he is sick, and dying for a drink of cold water, none must administer to his necessity, because it did not please God to let him see as some of his brethren saw, or because he would not pretend to believe what he thought wrong. If he be rich, he must live and die alone: his large ships may lie and rot, he may do all his work himself; he must till his land himself; he must reap, thresh, grind, bake, &c. he must be his own spinner, weaver, tailor; and, in fine, unaided in sickness and in death, help himself. If rich, notwithstanding his affluence, his hundreds of thousands, he can purchase nothing from the saints, nor procure the least help on any occasion. He must eat his morsel alone, for his property is completely confiscated, for it is of no use to him. They will not kill him; no, they will only let him die. Q.

PAUL'S ACCOMMODATION.

I am made all things to all men. 1 Cor. ix. 22.

I do not know of any thing that is more unpopular than the truth. A little *error* operates as an excellent seasoning; it accommodates the passions, and suits the principles and opinions of mankind. It is like a savoury dish, when the tastes of the parties have been consulted, and all the little variations and formula of the good eater attended to. The changes and fluctuations in the principles and practice of mankind, are as various as their features; and sub-

ject to as many impulses as there are motives to stimulate, or passions to serve. The man is not the same man at all times and seasons. The atmosphere of his feelings is sometimes surcharged with passion, then with moderation. At one time with profusion, at another with parsimony. His mental vision is sometimes clear, then cloudy. His prospects are at one period brilliant, and his imagination, without a shade, draws a glowing and extensive picture. See him again, when disappointment, like an angry cloud, has bedimmed his views, and the sombre hue of unpropitious feeling blacken every thought, and bursts, at intervals, in the thunder of gloomy invective. Paul, thy motives and thy principles were too buoyant with sincerity, to admit of depression without a cause, and vascillating movements where no sympathy could identify you as a party with unhallowed expectations and resentments. Paul could never be a Proteus in a field like this; where action was the effect of frenzy, parsimony, pride and avarice. And thou never would show, in grimace and pretence, a fellow-feeling with absurdity.

There is certainly a mistake in conjecture, when affinity is outraged, and the law of nature made the pander of, and scape goat for, the madman's eccentricities. All men are not the same men at all times. The sick man and the man in health, the living and the dead man, surely are different. The charitable man and the miser, the hateful and the hating, cannot stand for the same original. The solution is found in a short sentence. *Man is changeable*. There cannot be a change, without a difference. I would rescue the reputation of Paul from the aspersion of modern expedients. Paul, what wert thou with the malicious? I know that thou possessed a forbearing disposition, and dare not charge thee with a hellish passion. Saul of Tarsus might glow with resentment, and hurl "firebrands, arrows and death;" but Paul was merciful. Duty stood the sentinel, and love watched at the portals of thy gate. Thou wert the reverse of all that run the random race of folly; and if thou wert all things to all men, thy conduct is evidence of the purity of thy views, and circumspection of thy ways, in being all things that are right and praiseworthy; while so many were thy opponents in principle, and the reverse of thee in practice.

ANOTHER GOSPEL.

The following may be introduced as extra evidence of the corrupt principles of modern clergymen, who preach a gospel founded on *money*, instead of being founded on Christ. The apostles of Christ *never* appealed to mankind, and demanded their *money*, as an indispensable requisite to the salvation of *souls*! Now we lay this down as an infallible criterion, that, *God's* ministers will preach *Christ*, and the *devil's* ministers—**MONEY!**

"A SOLEMN APPEAL."

"You give, perhaps, a few shillings or a few dollars in order to employ a servant of Jesus Christ in declaring the Divine mercy to your brethren in the new settlements, who are not refreshed by Christian

ordinances, or to the ignorant, deluded, perishing heathen. You bestow a trifle, from gratitude to your Saviour, in a spirit of obedience, and from love to the souls of men. In this way the gospel is carried to a dying sinner in the wilderness. That sinner repents; and when he repents, all the angels of God shout for joy. A thrill of rapture runs through heaven—through cherubim, seraphim, and all the ranks of the sons of God. He repents and dies, and joins the angelic host, and unites in their song. You too, die, and as your spirit glides away from this gross state of being, and ascends to the bright regions of eternal holiness, and joy, and glory—instantly there breaks upon you a shout of ten thousand times ten thousand, and sweeter than the music of the spheres—"Welcome, child of benevolence, friend of Jesus; welcome to this heavenly habitation, of which God and the Lamb are the everlasting light. Here all is love."

Think of this, poor mortal, from whose grasp death will in a few days tear every cent of your money; think of this, and then say, if you can, that you have nothing to bestow. Think of this, and then, if you can, waste your property in luxury, or hoard it up for the rust, or expend it all in some promising adventure, from which you hope, that you or your sons will reap a harvest of profit, and say that you have nothing to give. Alas! "What will profit you, if you gain the whole world, and lose your own soul?" Alas! will you have no *stock* in the heavens? No *adventure* in the eternal world? No *mansion* in the skies? No *obligation* or *bond* to secure to you a *field*, a *possession*, an *estate*, in the regions of eternal light and glory? Shall all your treasure be in the dust of the ground? Then a thief may steal it—the fire may burn it—the tempest may scatter it—the flood may overwhelm it. But surely death will tear you away from it for ever.

Think of this, and then, if you can, be niggardly in giving for the aid of missions; and cold in speaking in favour of missions, and heartless in praying for the success of missions."

Pres. Allen's Sermon.

WANT OF CONSISTENCY AMONG THE FRIENDS.

As one appealing for my Christian right in the society of Friends, I hereby publicly testify, that I withdraw my appeal, because of their injustice and unfairness towards me in the administration of their discipline. First—In instituting a complaint against me unidentified, and consequently without proof. And, Secondly, for trying me on such vague complaint, by committees of their own choosing; and condemning me without giving me a hearing in any of their meetings for discipline; all which proceedings are aside from the profession which they make, antichristian and unfair.

This complaint, if I understand it right, was brought against me for not uniting with them* in a certain speculative point in religion. Thus speculation has become the test of membership, if not of faith, among the Friends. O that they might consider the Rock from whence they were hewn, and

the hole of the pit from whence they have been dug, that the Lord might be God; and faith in his holy Spirit, accompanied by good works, the only true test of membership: then he would be a healer of breaches to this people, and restorer of paths for them to dwell in. JOSEPH C. DEAN.

* And this is strange, for they disagree daily among themselves on speculative points in religion.

Nut. Advo.

We insert the above at the request of a friend. We must say, we think, that man is accountable to God only, for his opinions and principles. It is the duty of man to exhort, reprove, and advise his brother. The Scriptures recognize no imaginary offences. There must be a wrong done, not imagined—there must be an injury sustained, not supposed, before a man is to be treated as a publican.—There is but one effectual remedy for these evils, and that is *charity*! "Let him that is without sin among you, first cast a stone."

ANECDOTE.

Some years ago, a delirious man attended a Universalist meeting, in company with a brother who had great control over him. The preacher in illustration of the justice and goodness of God in the salvation of all men, adduced the character of President Washington. "He was a benevolent man. Placed in the highest seat of national authority, he sought to promote the happiness of *all*. He bore no ill will to a single person in the nation. He did not delight in tormenting the meanest subject." The man beside himself was uneasy, and frequently attempted to rise and speak, but his brother held him by the coat. As the preacher however still enlarged on the universal benevolence of Washington, he at length broke from the grasp of his keeper, and stepping forward, exclaimed, "True, but in time of the rebellion in Pennsylvania, Washington turned *his whole artillery* against the insurgents." The preacher was confounded, and closed his harangue.—*Quere.* Which of the two had the best claim to reason? *Rel. Rem.*

REMARKS.

The above anecdote is going the rounds in the papers devoted to priestcraft and money. We should be pleased to have the authors of this *squib* tell more about it, and give names and place, &c. It is not surprising that these people resort to the insane, and their sayings, for help. The story is pitiful at best; the worse, however, for being a *lie*! The abettors of this attempt at deception would do well to consider, that with the rational their story defeats their own purpose. Washington was *merciful*. The event proved it. His artillery was not turned against the insurgents to destroy them for ever, but to convince and convert them—to vindicate the law, which had for its object the *good* of these very insurgents! Turn and twist as they may, these orthodox gentry must acknowledge, that *cruelty* is confined to the *dévil* and his coadjutors, who are eager to destroy mankind, and perpetuate, world without end, their misery.

LICENTIOUS TENDENCY OF UNIVERSALISM.

From the Gospel Advocate.

AN EXAMPLE WORTHY OF IMITATION.

Mr. John Winn, of Campaign county, state of Ohio, was formerly a slave-holder in Kentucky, at which time he was a member of the Baptist society, and for several years strenuously advocated their cause. But at length, he had serious impressions that his belief was not according to divine revelation; and after a general search of the Scriptures, laying aside superstition, priestcraft, bigotry, &c. and calling reason in exercise, he found that the way of life and salvation was made for all—and that all created intelligences would finally be participators of the same. Under these impressions he felt the culpability of holding in bondage a part of the human family, nor could he rest till he had liberated them from slavery. Accordingly he moved them to the state of Ohio—gave each (five in number) eighty acres of land, farming utensils, &c. and bade them work for themselves. He also gave the state of Ohio bonds for their good behaviour. After this, Mr. Winn, with another brother in the belief of the final salvation of all men, bought three slaves in the state of Kentucky, for whom they gave two hundred dollars; after which they set them free, gave them lands in Ohio, and became security for their good behaviour. These slaves were purchased of a *Baptist Deacon*, of the same church to which Mr. Winn belonged. Mr. Winn rejoiceth that the Lord will turn the hearts of his children unto him; that every knee will bow and every tongue swear that they have righteousness and strength in the Lord, and that all the ends of the earth will see the salvation of our God.

AUTHOR OF VADE-MECUM.

The author of the "Vade-Mecum," the Rev. Dr. Hooper Cumming, has left Albany, and is located in Vandewater-street, in this city. We understand he commenced, on Sunday, June 1st, by venting a violent philippic against Universalism. At present we shall leave the reverend gentleman to the fostering care of his *new* admirers. We only recommend to him the serious consideration of the old trite saying—"The least that is said, is the soonest mended!"

"Wo unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." *SCRIPTURE.*

PROPOSALS

Have been issued for publishing at Little Falls, (N. Y.) a work, to be entitled

THE GOSPEL INQUIRER,

To be published semi-monthly, at \$1 per annum, payable in advance. *Rel. Inq.*

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1823.

NO. 7.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

A SCRIPTURAL HINT

Upon the Doctrines of Arminianism, Calvinism, and Universalism.

In the Holy Scriptures we find the following terms, "Natural man—old man—old man with his deeds—old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts—man of sin—son of perdition—children of the devil—children of wrath," &c. &c. Now there is no doubt but all these terms mean the same thing. In the Scriptures we also find such terms as these, "Man in the image of God—new man—new creature—man in Christ Jesus—the righteous," &c. &c. In the epistles of Paul the apostle, the phrase "*in Christ*," occurs ninety-five times; "*in the Lord*," about thirty times; "*in God*," eight times; of which, the following passages are a specimen.

Faith is in Christ Jesus. "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. iii. 15. "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. i. 13.

Salvation is in Jesus Christ. "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Jesus Christ, with eternal glory," 2 Tim. ii. 10.

Forgiveness of sins is in Jesus Christ. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace," Eph. i. 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Col. i. 14.

Acceptance is in Jesus Christ. "To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved," Eph. i. 6.

Wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," 1 Cor. i. 30.

Eternal life is in Christ. "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. i. 1. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory," Col. iii. 3, 4. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son," 1 John v. 11.

The church is in Jesus Christ. "Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. i. 1. and 1 Thess. i. 1.

Election is in Jesus Christ. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love," Eph. i. 3, 4. "Salute Rufus, chosen in the Lord, and his mother, and mine," Rom. xvi. 13.

Good works are in Jesus Christ. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Eph. ii. 10.

Repentance is from Jesus Christ. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins," Acts v. 31. "When they heard these things they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life," Acts xi. 18. "Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death," 2 Cor. vii. 10. Thus, reader, you see that the whole work of salvation is performed in the Lord Jesus Christ; therefore, the natural man has nothing to do with it. If we wish to understand the Scriptures rightly, we must draw a proper line of distinction between the natural man, and the new man in Christ Jesus. See Rom. vi. 6. and vii. 9—11. Gal. ii. 20.

CONTRAST.

The natural man is under the law of sin. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.—A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.—They that are in the flesh cannot please God."

The whole human race, in the natural man, is under the curse of the law of God. "Now we know, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before

The new man is under the law of righteousness. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit.—Who-soever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

The whole human race in Christ Jesus shall be blessed. "In the seed of Abraham (Christ,) shall all the nations, all the families, and all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."

God.—Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them."

To the natural man it is said, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." See Rom. iii. 9—13. Psal. xiv. 2, 3.

The natural man knoweth not God; believeth not, and obeyeth not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, &c.—He that believeth not is condemned already.—He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

The whole human race in the natural man, "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." "Behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. iv. 1. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," Ezek. xviii. 4, 20. "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death," Rev. xxi. 8. The natural man has "done evil" unto the resurrection of damnation."

The natural man is not elected, being a child of wrath. Every denunciation in the Scriptures is denounced against the natural man. That the immortal soul is, or shall ever be destroyed, is a most miserable absurdity. Because, "God only hath immortality." Therefore, the immortal soul must be of the same nature of God, otherwise it is not immortal.

The natural man produces no good works. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?—Whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, neither known him."

Arminians, Calvinists, and Universalists, you now see your favourite doctrines completely reconciled in your great Redeemer. In him your works are perfect; in him you are elected, and in him the whole human race shall be restored. Suffer me now, as your friend, to exhort you; instead of looking to the creeds and doctrines of men, look to the word of God. Instead of believing the traditions of men, believe the word of your Heavenly Father. And, instead of looking through the medium of the flesh, where you will see nothing but misery and wrath, look, by faith, through the medium of the Spirit, to that within the veil, where you will behold, seated on the throne of his love, your merciful and unchangeable God. There you will see your blessed Redeemer, in whom exists your immortal soul, which shall survive the destruction of all earthly things.

UNIVERSALIST.

To the new man in Christ Jesus it is said, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

The new man in Christ Jesus, knoweth God, believeth, and obeyeth the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.—Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.—He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life."

The whole human race in Christ Jesus shall be blessed, gathered together, made alive, &c." "In thy seed (Christ,) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," Gen. xxii. 18. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed," Gen. xii. 3. "In thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed," Acts iii. 25. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him," Eph. i. 9, 10. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," 1 Cor. xv. 22. "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation.—In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory," Isa. xlv. 17, 25.

The new man in Christ Jesus is elected in Christ Jesus. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ. According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love," Eph. i. 3, 4.

The new man in Christ produces good works. "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

NOTE.—We recommend to the reader, in perusing the above, to remember, that man, by nature, is good; by practice, contrary to nature, is evil. The natural man is just as God made him. The man without natural affections is a monster of iniquity. There is an animal and a spiritual man. The converted Paul had an animal man, a "law in his members warring against the law of his mind." The animal man, or law in the members, is a creature confined to this mode of being, and would, if possible, circumscribe the law of the mind, and bind it down to the gross conceptions of this imperfect and sublunary state. It is, therefore, the animal man, or law in the members, which cannot discern spiritual things. Please to examine, with the attention it merits, Rom. vii.

Now, let it be remembered, that the effect will continue as long as the cause remains. The men-

bers must have a law. The mind, when enlightened, will have a law different from the law of the darkened mind, which is in captivity to the law of the members. We consider the love of popularity, of the world, and, particularly, of *large salaries*, to be incontrovertible evidence that the law of the members is *master*, and the man, with all his pretensions, a *slave*, and not Christ's free man! We make this distinction, however,—Paul's warfare was continual. He did not accept of *three or four thousand dollars*, per annum, and *make peace*! Now the warfare in the one case appears to be this, not to resist the solicitations of the *animal* man, but to rally *all* the forces on his side, acquire every thing for him, and fatten him on the best the market affords! whether of beef—stylish houses, or pride and adulation. If our divine doctors aim at an excuse, we cannot see any chance for success, unless they intend, by *surfeiting* their animal man, to *kill him* outright, and be rid of him! Ed.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

INDIANS AND MISSIONARIES.

In the summer of 1805, a number of principal chiefs and others of the Six Nations of Indians, assembled at Buffalo Creek, in the state of New-York, at the particular request of a gentleman missionary, (Mr. Cram,) from the state of Massachusetts. The missionary being furnished with an interpreter, and accompanied by the United States' agent for Indian affairs, met the Indians in council, when the following talk took place:

First, by the Agent.

Brothers of the Six Nations,—I rejoice to meet you at this time, and thank the Great Spirit that he has preserved you in health, and given me another opportunity to take you by the hand.

Brothers,—The person who sits by me is a friend, who has come a great way to hold a talk with you. He will inform you what his business is; and it is my request that you will listen with attention to his words.

MISSIONARY.

My Friends,—I am thankful for the opportunity afforded us of uniting together at this time. I had a desire to see you, and inquire into your state and welfare; for this purpose I have travelled a great distance, being sent by your old friends, the Boston Missionary Society.

You will recollect they formerly sent missionaries among you to instruct you in religion, and labour for your good; although they have not heard from you for a long time, yet they have not forgotten their brothers of the Six Nations, and are still anxious to do you good.

Brothers,—I have not come to get your lands or your money, but to enlighten your minds, and instruct you how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his will—to preach to you the *gospel of his Son Jesus Christ*.

There is but one religion, and but one way to serve God; and if you do not embrace the right way, you cannot be happy hereafter. You have never worshipped the Great Spirit in a manner ac-

ceptable to him, but have all your lives been in great error and darkness. To endeavour to remove these errors, and open your eyes so that you might see clearly, is my business with you.

Brothers,—I wish to talk with you as one friend talks with another; and if you have any objections to receive the religion which we preach, I wish you to make them, and I will endeavour to satisfy your minds, and remove these objections.

Brothers,—I want you to speak your minds freely, for I wish to reason with you on the subject, and if possible remove all doubts from your minds. The subject is an important one, and it is of consequence that you give it an early attention, while the offer is made to you. Your friends, the Boston Missionary Society, will continue to send good and faithful ministers to instruct and strengthen you in religion, if on your part you are willing to receive them.

Brothers,—Since I have been in this part of the country I have visited some of your small villages, and talked with your people. They appear willing to receive instruction; but as they look up to you as their elder brothers in council, they want first to know your opinion on the subject.

You have now heard what I have to say at present; I therefore hope you will take it into consideration, and give me an answer before I leave the place.

After about two hours consultation among themselves, the chief, called Red Jacket, arose and spoke as follows:

Friend and Brother,—It was the will of the great Spirit that we should meet together this day. He orders all things, and has given us a fine day for our council. He has taken his garment from before the sun, and caused it to shine with brightness upon us: our eyes are opened that we see clearly, and our ears are unstopped that we have been able to hear distinctly the words you have spoken. For all these favours we thank the Great Spirit, and *Him only*.

Brother,—This council fire was kindled by you. It was at your request that we came together at this time. We have listened with attention to what you have said. You requested us to speak our minds freely. This gives us great joy, for we now consider that we stand upright before you, and can speak what we think. All have heard your voice, and all speak to you now as one man. Our minds are agreed.

Brother,—You say you want an answer to your talk before you leave the place. It is right that you should have one, as you are at a great distance from home, and we do not wish to detain you; but we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people.

Brother,—Listen to what we say: There was a time when our forefathers owned this great island. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit had made it for the use of Indians. He had created the buffalo, the deer, and other animals for food: he had made the bear and

the beaver, whose skins served us for clothing. He had scattered them over the country, and taught us how to take them. He had caused the earth to produce corn for bread. All this he had done for his red children, because he *loved them*. If we had some disputes about our hunting ground, they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood. But an evil day came among us: your forefathers crossed the great water, and landed on this island. Their numbers were small; but they found friends, and not enemies. They told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and had come here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat; we took pity on them, granted their request, and they sat down among us. We gave them corn and meat: they gave us poison in return! [alluding to ardent spirits.] The white people had now found our country; tidings were carried back, and more came amongst us; yet we did not fear them, for we took them to be friends. They called us brothers—we believed them, and gave them a larger seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased. They wanted more land; they wanted our country! Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. War took place—Indians were hired to fight against Indians! and many of our people were destroyed. They also introduced strong liquor amongst us. It was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

Brother,—Our seats were once larger, and yours were small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied; you want to force your religion upon us.

Brother,—Continue to listen. You say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his mind; and if we do not take hold of the religion which you preach, we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say that you are right, and we are wrong; but how do we know this to be true? We understand your religion is written in a book. If it was intended for us as well as you, why has not the Great Spirit given it to us; and not only to us, but why did he not give to our forefathers the knowledge of that book, and the means of understanding it rightly? We only know what you tell us about it. How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

Brother,—You say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit: if there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why not all agree, as you can all read the book?

Brother,—We do not understand these things.—We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers, and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion which the Great Spirit gave to our forefathers, and has been handed down to us, and we worship accordingly. It teaches us to be thankful for all the favours we receive, to love each other and be united. We never quarrel about religion.

Brother,—The Great Spirit made us all; but he has made a difference between his white and red

children. He has given us different complexions and different customs. To you he has discovered the arts: to us they have been kept out of sight. We know these things to be true; and, since he has made us so different in other respects, why may we not conclude he has given us a different religion, according to our understandings? The Great Spirit does right. He knows what is best for his children: we are satisfied.

Brother,—We are told that you have been preaching to the white people in this place. These people are our neighbours: we will therefore wait a little, and see what effect your preaching has upon them. If we find it does them good: makes them honest, makes them love each other, and less disposed to cheat Indians, we will then consider of what you have said.

Brother,—You have now heard our answer to your talk, and this is all we have to say at present. As we are going to part, we will rise and take you by the hand, and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey, and return you safe to your friends.

As the Indians began to approach Mr. —, he rose hastily from his seat, and replied that he could not take them by the hand; there was no fellowship between the religion of God, and the works of the devil. This being interpreted to the Indians, they smiled, and retired in a peaceable manner.

It being afterwards suggested to Mr. —, that his reply to the Indians was rather indiscreet, he observed, that he supposed the ceremony of shaking hands would be received by them as a token that he assented to what they had said; being otherwise informed, he said he was sorry for the expressions.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." SCRIPTURE.

Mr. Editor.—On Sunday, the 15th, inst. I was at Newark, N. J., and being informed that there was to be preaching at the Court-house in the evening, and that the prisoners would be present, I felt a desire to hear what the speaker would say to those poor unfortunate fellow sinners, (well knowing the general opinion of the clergy respecting such characters,) but on entering the court-room, I saw none of the prisoners present. The speaker was reading a hymn, but as its contents was not to the honour of the *God of the whole earth*, I could not sing with them. After prayer, the speaker stated, that he was that evening from Bellville, and unexpectedly called on to speak here, consequently had not time to study his discourse. (So every one that heard him must have thought.) His text was from Luke xv. 11, &c. verses, (the parable of the *prodigal son*;) in which discourse, the preacher, W. R. a licensed speaker from the John-street Methodist Society, advanced the following: When man was created, he was superior to angels. Before the fall of man, the earth was the Lord's—after the fall of man, the earth became the estate, or property, of the devil, and the devil was the citizen to whom the prodigal son hired himself; but that the prodigal

gal was the Son of God, and the devil had no right to hold him in slavery, and that the prodigal must return to his Father's house. W. K. said, the son felt a spirit of independence, and therefore demanded his portion of his Father, and that an independent spirit was the first step to prodigality. (How the independent, free born American liked that, from the mouth of an Irish gentleman, I know not.)

Again—W. R. said, that the prodigal arose and went to his father, and his father met him and kissed him, and that the kiss denoted that God was reconciled to his Son, (An apostle hath said, "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself;" not God to man:) and ordered the fatted calf to be killed. W. R. said, *Christ* was the fatted calf! That he was slain for sinners. By looking at the 23d verse, I read, that the fatted calf was eaten. Was Christ slain, and then *eaten*? W. R. stated, that Unitarians, Socinians, Atheists, Deists, and Universalists, were feeding the prodigals with the husks; that Universalists were the worst, were the filth of the world, denied the Scriptures, and ought not to be admitted into any church. Our blessed Lord and Master said, I came not to judge; but look at him who calls himself the servant of Christ, taking the judgment seat, and condemning his brother sinner to a never-ending state of torment; for he shut out from heaven the drunkard, swearer, sabbath-breaker, &c. &c. but did not exclude the liar, who we hope he will not forget in his next discourse.

Our friend, to answer what end I know not, stated that, to his certain knowledge, there were *twenty ministers* in New-York, that had turned from their former faith; and that one minister had cut his throat. I had lived in New-York above eighteen years. I was astonished at hearing, now, for the first time, this report. Our friend then said, Look at the prodigals up above, meaning the prisoners, they have come from a far country; some from England, Ireland, probably from France, South and North America; and then said, We are about to take up a collection for them, and urged the people to give liberally; and, by way of drawing out the *money*, informed them, that if they would give only *one dollar*, he would see that their names should be written in *God's eternal book of life*! That he would even promise them, that the Lord would also repay them in *this life*. What a reflection on the people of Newark! What! do not they provide for the wants of the poor unfortunate prisoners? Yes. Two gentlemen arose, and stated to W. R. that there was no need of a collection; that the prisoners' wants were provided for.

When W. R. came out of the court room, I inquired of him, Who is the unfortunate minister that has cut his throat? He replied, It is a Methodist speaker. I then asked him, Who are the *twenty ministers* who have renounced their faith? If he would please to name one! When a friend, in company with the gentleman, named Mr. K. and Mr. M. I then replied, As to these, they never were public teachers of any doctrine but that they now advocate. As respected the other eighteen ministers, he could not name *one*! I asked W. R. in what

part of the Bible he found Christ called the *fatted-calf*? Observing to him, that Christ was styled the scape goat, and the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. To which he replied, He had observed, he had no time to study his discourse.

W. R. asserted, that the Universalists did not believe this text—"The wicked shall be turned into hell; with all the nations that forget God." To which I replied, We rejoice in it. We believe you will have your portion. We believe *all* the words of God, and hear Christ say, "Man [all men] shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." But as W. R. believed, once in hell, always there, I would inform him, that David declared, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the *lowest hell*;" and that, while he was in this life.

On my return to New-York, a Methodist minister journeyed with me. I inquired of him respecting the gentleman who had cut his throat. He informed me, that he was not now a preacher, but was formerly one in that church. Now, be it known to all men, that I will give W. R. credit for all the truth he may hereafter promulgate.

Mr. Editor, your remarks on this communication will be pleasing to yours, D. J.

Note—We shall only say, we think that W. R. would employ his time more profitably in the *study* of the Scriptures for his *own* information, than in expounding them for the instruction of others. For, "*rightly dividing* the word of truth," and *tearing* it in pieces, are two things! Ed.

RANK HYPOCRISY EXPOSED.

"*Out of thy own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked and unprofitable servant.*"

In our last Number we remarked, as we were in duty bound, on the hypocrisy and deception of clergymen, who lay heavy burdens upon men's shoulders, but will not themselves put forth so much as one of their fingers. We are fully aware, that all those who are priestridden will *kick*. All who fear when no danger assails them, will tremble. All who are in the practice of letting the time for *action* pass away while they *deliberate*, will accuse us of being hasty. All those whose fears, hopes and expectations, are graduated on a wrong scale, will face to the right-about, and be governed by circumstances. For ourselves, we have no alternative. We *have grasped the plow*—we will never look back. If there is no success in prospect, in man's estimation, (speaking after the manner of men,) we will *make success*! But there is. The cause of God and all men will prevail.

"*Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,*" is the exhortation of Christ. The Missionary and Bible Society schemers, say, of the *objects* of the abettors of the Missionary Society, &c. "These must commend themselves to every conscience that is in *any degree enlightened*, and certainly to every heart that *can feel* for those who are destitute of gospel privileges." Ye pious doctors of Divinity, how will you stand this test of your own making! What shall we say of the Rev. doctors S. and M.? One of whom refused

to pay his dues to the Bible, and the other to the Missionary Society. Are they in "any degree enlightened? Can they feel?" According to the rule they and their compeers make binding on others, they are not "in any degree enlightened;" neither "can they feel!" These folks say, "The cry is continually heard," &c. "Send us a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ." What ministers do they send? Ministers of Christ? No! Ministers of Calvin, Hopkins, &c. who preach the dogmas of men, and excommunicate those who have the honesty to profess their faith in Christ, and reject their darling errors and traditions!

Look calmly and dispassionately at the consequences of these shameful proceedings. Consider the Bible Society, a Pharisaical monster with so many heads, which, on their own premises are not "in any degree enlightened," and "cannot feel," &c. *Seven hundred and twenty* clergymen, life members, an overwhelming majority by their concentration and influence; and despotic in their government and rule. Men, generally, who are not sufficiently enlightened to see, and cannot feel the objects of the society! This was more than proved by the result of their report. *A mere farce!* A ridiculous and wicked pretence of doing much for the *poor*, and in fact rivetting the chains they have forged on the public mind, and establishing, if possible, their own popularity, by praises, thanks and compliments, disgusting and fulsome, because uttered by themselves, and not deserved! "Let the stranger praise thee," says Solomon. But these men, filling seats which their own purses were too sacred to purchase, are praising each other, and like the Pharisees of old, greeting in the markets, and figuring with all their might, in the chief seats and highest rooms!

Look again at the picture—Is not the result such as facts alone could warrant? What economy could be expected in *charity*, from the most extravagant class of society? We speak of the New-York Phalanx of holy parsons in particular. Men, whose pretensions die the moment they come in contact with the pestiferous effluvia of their extravagant and unnecessary expenditures. A man who cannot maintain, on his own confession, an ordinary sized family with the round sum of *two thousand five hundred dollars* for a year, is singularly qualified to be a director and adviser in the use of the funds of the comparatively *poor*!!!

Look again—Have words any meaning? Will you, ye men of sense, of reason, of propriety, who honourably pretend to consistency, and are enlightened, and can feel, will you shut your eyes to these facts, which are as plain as if written in letters of fire? Hear their repeated declarations, uttered with a pretended solemnity. You know, that these men are almost continually besieging the public ear with the cry—The heathen are dropping into an endless hell, for want of *money* to save them. *Every dollar will go far to save some poor soul.* Is there any truth in these declarations? If not, how wicked must those be, who deliberately make, and almost incessantly repeat them, for sordid and ava-

ricious purposes! Are they true? How inexpressibly abominable then, is the conduct of those, who every day of their lives squander in useless expenses, sums, which would save from endless perdition and misery, an immortal *soul*! If criminality is to be measured by the consequences of the actions, how many hundreds are immured in dungeons and state prisons, and condemned for being worthless wretches, whose conduct, compared with this, is almost innocent.

To every adult person, of every sect, who may be in the possession of sufficient reason to constitute them sane, we say, *You know these things are so!* You dare not lay your hand on your heart, and, in the presence of your God and Judge, deny them. You know that you are in the practice of giving your assent to the truth of positions and premises, not supported by one half the weight of testimony. You have the evidence of your own senses to combat. These things are not done in a corner. Apply your own reasoning and concessions, and abide if you can, the investigation. You acknowledge your accountability to your God, and not to man, to the reversion of his commands and requisitions. You admit the Scriptures as paramount authority, above all human laws and deductions. Why, then, do you outrage their plain doctrines, commands, and principles? Will you plead in extenuation, that your neighbour, your friend, and your minister, sanction, by their conduct and principles, your practice? Is this the salvo? Find another foundation on which to stand, for your props will fail you. Remember, pride and extravagance, however fashionable and holy in the estimation of clergymen, were never tolerated by Christ. Christ never preached the damnation of the heathen, and the ignorant *poor*. No! It was to the arrogant and proud, the self-styled holy, and the popular Pharisees, that he said—"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how shall ye escape the damnation of hell!"

Weigh the pretensions of these shameless beggars, who are continually crying *money*, and whose expenditures are more like the nabob than the apostle, in the balance of inspiration. Produce an equal number from any part of the human race, more fond of titles, honours and emoluments, and the things of this world, than these modern disciples of Calvin, Hopkins, and Co. Open your Bibles—Show me the amount of the salaries paid to the disciples and apostles of Christ, which they expended in luxuries, and in courting the applause of men. Turn to the chapter and verse, where the salvation of millions is declared to be in imminent danger, if millions of dollars are not paid into the hands of Christ's disciples to save them. If Christ never declared that the salvation of the family of man, nor any part thereof, depended on money given to priests, how dare you assert this to be the case? Is it not rank folly to argue that ministers cannot be obtained to preach the gospel, unless enormous sums of money are first raised to pay them? How much money was raised by contributions on the public, to fit out all the disciples and apostles of Christ? Open your Bible, and ascertain the amount. If money was

unnecessary then, and souls could be saved without the aid of it, what new command has since been issued and promulgated, making it indispensable in our day, and where is the command written? Is the all-merciful, great and good God, our Heavenly Father, less merciful than those money-loving parsons? Will nothing move him to save the souls of the creatures whom he hath made, but the prayers and preaching of men who believe the gospels taught by Calvin, Hopkins, and their adherents? Is this the case? Will not these men assist, unless you pay them the *ready cash*? Is this the example of Christ? Did he wait until a contribution was levied, and the *money* in hand paid, before he would preach, or engage in man's redemption? And his apostles and disciples—Did they imitate the Lord? Or, like modern preachers, did they hesitate until their salary was named, and the money paid; and this, when souls were dropping into hell daily and hourly, for want of their preaching? "If Baal be god, serve him. But, if the Lord be God, serve Him."

To the public, one and all, we say, unless you are determined to be hoodwinked and led blindfolded by aspiring men, and prefer error to truth, now is the time to break the chains which antichristian men have forged, and humanely free the Christian world from slavery. The criterion cannot mislead you. "My Kingdom," says Christ, "is not of *this world*." The kingdom of modern clergymen *is* of this world. No class of men can be found more ardently in love with this world and its vanities than they. On the one hand we see the disciples of Christ, like their Master, despising the riches and honours of this world, and exerting themselves to free their fellow men from the chains of priestcraft and superstition. On the other, we see the disciples of Calvin, Hopkins, and Co., grasping at riches and honours, and in their houses and equipage, the true followers of the ancient Pharisees, who were the enemies of Christ, and his cross. Like them, they strive to bind heavy burdens on men's shoulders, and make them slaves to superstition, that they may drain their purses, and riot in abundance and idleness! **HUMILITY** shone conspicuous in Christ and his disciples and apostles. **PRIDE** shone as conspicuous in the Pharisees of old, and still remains the indelible impress of error, the mark of hypocrisy and deception.

We trust the reign of the great beast, antichrist, is verging to a close. His emissaries grow more haughty and imperious than ever, a certain prelude to their fall and destruction. Pure religion, which is to visit the *fatherless* and the *widow* in their affliction, and to keep unspotted from the world, will rise on the ruins of error, and the money and means, now squandered in the support of haughty, proud, luxurious priests, and their adherents, will gladden the hearts of the poor and distressed, and superstition and cruelty be banished from the abodes of men. A reformation in the religious world, is quite as necessary now as in days of yore. The distinctions kept up by antichristian priests, and their emissaries, are a fruitful source of misery to

mankind, and produce the most malevolent and hellish passions, of hatred, envy, pride, and uncharitableness. With the disciples of Christ, no man is common. His condition, however miserable by his sins and depravity, is pitied; and every effort is made to smooth the rough acclivities of life, and give the mourner peace. Antichrist's disciples, love only their own. The poison of asps is under their lips. They consign all who offend them to an endless hell; and will not even grant salvation to their friends, unless they are paid in ready cash, and feasted with honour and dignities.

From a Baltimore Paper.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY IN INDIA.

A very curious controversy has lately taken place in Calcutta, between the missionaries and the celebrated Ram Mohun Roy. This latter personage is a native of India, and distinguished for his opulence, his superior talents, his very great learning, and especially for having, of his own accord, early renounced the theology of his countrymen, and asserted the doctrine of the divine unity.

His first writings were designed to prove, that the ancient books of Hindu theology, in their original state, did not sanction polytheism, nor idol worship. These, he contended, were additions, which had been engrafted into the primitive system, deformed its simplicity, and corrupted its purity. About five years ago he published in the English language, extracts from the Vedas, or Sacred Books of the Hindus, for the purpose of establishing this point.*

In the course of the late controversy, speaking of himself in the third person, he says, that "although he was born a Bramin, he renounced idolatry at a very early period of his life, but published at that time a treatise in Arabian and Persian, against the system, and no sooner acquired a tolerable knowledge of the English, than he made his desertion of idol worship known to the Christian world by his English publications; a renunciation which, I am sorry to say, brought severe difficulties upon him, by exciting the displeasure of his parents, and subjecting him to the dislike of his near, as well as distant relations, and to the hatred of nearly all his countrymen for several years." After this period, he earnestly engaged in the study of Christianity, but often expressed the difficulties which occurred to him respecting some of the abstruse doctrines taught by the missionaries. In regard to the doctrine of the trinity in particular, he declared, after mature examination, that if this were essential to Christianity, the whole scheme would be to him insurmountable. It resembled so much the polytheism of the Hindu religion, which he had laboured to disprove, that he could not consider it as making any part of a system of divine truth, which proceeded from God, and which inculcated the worship of one Supreme Being. And although it would not seem that his researches have conducted him to a belief of this mystery, yet a writer in a late English publication says, "there appears every reason to

* Other particulars respecting this subject may be seen in the first volume of the *Miscellany*, p. 75.

believe, that he is, in the honest persuasion of his own mind, a Christian, and entertains no doubt of the divine authority of Jesus, and the truth of the Christian revelation.[†]

More than a year ago, Ram Mohun Roy published in Calcutta, a work, *The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness*. This consisted of compilations from the four Gospels, embracing the Sermon on the Mount, and nearly all the moral precepts and instructions of Christ. To this treatise, one of the missionaries, supposed to be the Rev. J. Marshman, replied, and made serious objections, chiefly on the ground, that the doctrinal parts of the New Testament were not inserted, as well as the moral and preceptive. Ram Mohun Roy immediately came forward with an answer, entitled, *An Appeal to the Christian Public, in defence of "The Precepts of Jesus."* One paragraph of this Appeal is all for which we have room, but this acquaints us with facts of the highest importance. After several spirited and sensible remarks, meeting the objections of his opponents, and reminding them of the dissensions and bitter persecutions which had prevailed among Christians, wholly on account of their obscure and metaphysical dogmas, the author continues:

"Besides, the compiler residing on the same spot where European Missionary gentlemen and others, for a period of upwards of twenty years, have been, with a view to promote christianity, distributing in vain among the natives, numberless copies of the complete Bible, written in different language, could not be altogether ignorant of the *cause of their disappointment*. He has seen with regret, *that they have completely counteracted their own benevolent efforts*, by introducing all the dogmas and mysteries taught in Christian churches, to people by no means prepared to receive them, and that they have been so *incautious and inconsiderate* in their attempts to enlighten the natives of India, as to address their instructions to them in the same way, as if they were reasoning with persons brought up in a Christian country, with those dogmatical notions imbibed from their infancy. The consequence has been, that the natives in general, instead of benefiting by the perusal of the Bible, copies of which they always receive gratis, exchange them very often for blank paper; and generally use several of the dogmatical terms, in their native language, as a mark of slight, in an irreverent manner; the mention of which is repugnant to my feelings. Sabat, an eminently learned, but grossly unprincipled Arab, whom our divines supposed they had converted to Christianity, and whom they of course instructed in all the doctrines and dogmas, wrote, a few years ago, a treatise in Arabic, against those very dogmas, and printed himself, and published several hundred copies of this very work. And another Mussulman, of the name of Ena' et Ahmud, a man of respectable family, who is still alive, speedily returned to Mahometanism from Christianity, pleading that he

had not been able to reconcile to his understanding, certain dogmas which were imparted to him."

NOISY PRAYERS.

Jesus Christ, whom religionists claim to imitate, said, (Matt. vi. 5, 6.) "And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

We ask some of our Methodist friends, (who are very noisy,) if they consider the words "*Enter into thy closet,—shut thy door,*" &c. mean, *Open thy doors and windows*, and bawl loud enough to disturb a whole neighbourhood, at unseasonable hours? If they have been in the practice of labouring under this misconstruction of the passage, we beg leave to set them right; and convince them, that the words have no such meaning. It cannot be a matter of agreeable choice, to any peaceable citizen, whether his rest is disturbed by midnight bacchanalians, stimulated with wine to boisterous revelry, or by midnight devotees to religious fanaticism, who, whatever may be their spirit and motive, produce the same disorderly effect! These unseasonable and outrageously noisy proceedings, is a great and growing evil in this city. It is the duty of the reasonable part of the community to discountenance it, by every proper influence they possess. For it is lamentable that any should be deluded to imitate the Pharisees of old, and pray to be seen of men; or the more ancient worshippers of Baal, whose god was *drowsy*, and thereby injure their lungs, and disturb their peaceable neighbours.

CONTRADICTION.

A friend handed us a book, "*The Touch Stone*," by Rev John Flavel, which was introduced among his family by a Presbyterian preacher in this city. This book declares, "*The devil hath not the entire piece; a remnant, according to election, is really and peculiarly the Lord's.*" Then men are exhorted "*to make their calling and election sure!*" What! Is not the remnant, which is *really* the Lord's, *secure*? Again—Speaking of saving grace, it is said, "*It is bestowed only upon those whom God has elected,*" &c. Can the non-elect make their election sure? If so, they must do without the *saving grace*, for that "*is bestowed only upon those whom God has elected.*" On the whole, according to Presbyterianism, if the Devil has not the *entire piece*, he has all but the list and selva! We think the Presbyterian Devil has more awarded him than belongs to him. His kingdom is as lasting as the doctrine of his advocates, and will go to destruction together. To this, we say, Amen!

[†] Monthly Repository, vol. xvi. for August 1821, p. 478. To this work we are chiefly indebted for the facts contained in the present article, respecting the controversy in Calcutta.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1823.

NO. 8.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Trenton, June 12, 1823.

Dear Sir—I send you herewith an Address of the Rev. Wm. Boswell, late Pastor of the Baptist Church of Trenton and Lamberton, to the members of said church, containing also his present Articles of Faith. This gentleman has been for many years a high-toned Calvinist. How much he has gained by his change of sentiment, the public may now have an opportunity to judge.

Your remarks on the XI. Articles, contained in his present Faith, would be acceptable.

Yours respectfully,

A SUBSCRIBER.

REMARKS, &c.

The Address, accompanying the above communication, is a pamphlet, 12mo. pp. 24, published in May last. We cannot well refrain from congratulating Mr. Boswell on his escape from the abominable hypothesis of John Calvin. He could not possibly lose by an exchange with any sentiment under heaven, however wicked, foolish, and absurd! For, if it is possible to concentrate all the essence of the most abominable, cruel, unnatural, vile, wicked, diabolical, and outrageously perverse principles in creation, into one common focus, that focus is *Calvinism*! The devil himself, is almost a saint, compared with the nameless thing these religionists pretend to worship. We say *pretend*, for no man, who is not lost to every honourable, honest, and humane feeling, can worship and adore a being whose *justice* and *mercy* are more to be deprecated than the devil's cruelty! For proof, read the following—A disciple of John Calvin (in a distant town) declared from the pulpit, Sunday, June 22, that god (that is *his* god,) would bring men into existence in this life, and make them miserable from their birth to their death, and then consign them to an *interminable hell*! And that, in doing this, he would be both *just* and *merciful*!!! There is nothing in Scripture or reason to authorize any man to *slander* the *devil* at this rate. If this preacher of Calvinism is *godly*, that is, perfect, as, what? As his heavenly *Father* is perfect? Heaven forgive me the bare supposition, or use of the sacred and endearing appellation of *Father*, coupled with such inexpressibly wicked sentiments. No! If this Calvinist is *imperfect*, as his Moloch is imperfect, and imitates his Moloch's cruelty, (i. e. his *justice* and *mercy*,) he will make his offspring as miserable as his malice and power can effect. He would prosecute to the last letter of the law, the man who should give him a character one half so vile, as the acknowledged character of the Moloch he worships. The words *justice* and *mercy* are

most vilely prostituted whenever they are mentioned and associated with such monstrous sentiments. We sicken at the disgusting recital, and turn from the picture of Calvinistic depravity, with unutterable detestation and abhorrence.

The poor frogs, in the fable, knew enough to prefer a *log* for a king, instead of a *serpent*! Let men learn wisdom from frogs and fables, if they will be taught it from no other source, and arise from the lethargy of Calvinistic corruption. The pagan, who worships his *harmless wooden god*, is a philosopher and a man, compared with him, who worships a powerful, cruel, and inveterate enemy.

Mr. Boswell has left the cruel hypothesis of Calvin, and, we understand, adopted the sentiments of those who style themselves the "New Jerusalem Church." This is something better; for in the stead of accusing the Creator of *making* his creatures miserable, this doctrine only teaches that he *permits* them to be miserable, and is too impotent, indifferent, or ignorant, to effect their holiness and happiness. Now, as indifference is the consequence of ignorance, not having that knowledge of things which is requisite to produce a corresponding estimate of their value, the deficiency may be considered to proceed from *impotence*, and *ignorance*. A being of this description would excite compassion. Whereas Calvin's Moloch must excite feelings of detestation, &c.

Mr. Boswell has published his faith, in eleven Articles. The seventh follows—

"VII. That after death man goes to a state *suited* to his condition, and either enjoys eternal pleasure in the presence of God and holy angels, or eternal wretchedness with miserable spirits; as his life has been good or evil."

After declaring this, we are astonished at reading the following in his ninth Article—

"IX. There is in the *soul* of man the *fire* and *light* of God, though lodged in a state of hiddenness, till discovered by the *providence* and *grace* of God."

We ask, Is "the *fire* and *light* of God, in the *soul* of man," to be eternally consigned to a *hell* of wretchedness, with miserable spirits? Does it not follow, from this hypothesis, that God is *partial*? Is not his "*providence* and *grace*," restricted to a part? Is it because God is deficient in power or wisdom, that His offspring, whose souls contain "the *fire* and *light* of God," are left to endure "eternal wretchedness, with miserable spirits?"

Mr. B. in his fourth Article, says of man, that "he is saved by *grace*, which is the divine *love* and *mercy*." We ask—Why is not the "*grace*, the di-

vine love and mercy," extended to all those, whose souls contain "the fire and light of God?" There is a lamentable deficiency somewhere in this hypothesis. Where is it? Is your *new* god deficient in power, wisdom, or goodness? He must be deficient in one or all of these attributes, or man, in the aggregate, must be saved; and "the fire and light of God," which you say is hidden in the soul of man, will go to its native heaven, and not, as you suppose, to an eternal hell! To Mr. B. we say, Stay not here. You have rejected one error; do not accept of another in exchange. "Prove all things—hold fast that which is good." It would be a great evil to consign "the fire and light of God" to an eternal hell; and let this fire and light remain hidden for ever, when God's love and mercy, which is lavished on a part, might bring the fire and light into operation, and secure the endless felicity of the whole.

Our correspondent, who politely sent us this pamphlet, requested our remarks on the eleven Articles. The eleventh reads as follows—

"XI. That *carnal warfare* is strictly forbidden, and altogether *incompatible with the religion of Christ*."

Pray, what is your "*eternal wretchedness with miserable spirits*?" What kind of warfare is this? Is it carnal or spiritual? And why is carnal warfare incompatible, &c.? Is it not because its tendency is to make *miserable*? How, then, is your "*eternal wretchedness*" compatible with the *religion of Christ*? Will you seek refuge in the sentiment avowed in your 10th Article, as follows? "True religion teaches us to *extend the hand of charity to all good men*, of whatever name they may be called!" We ask you, Sir, *Will the charity taught by your religion extend no farther*? If you answer Yes. Then your Articles are *carnal*. If you answer No. Then you condemn your religion, proving it to be different from the religion of Jesus Christ. He commanded charity, love, to be extended to all; enemies as well as friends. It appears Mr. Boswell is still in possession of error, and can claim affinity with the popular religionists of the day. True, he varies the rout to the carnal uncharitable hell of endless wretchedness; but conducts men there, and is quite as willing to protract their sufferings as his brother Calvinists.

For ourselves, we have no choice in error. You may let Swedenborg or Arminius *gild the pill*, the poison remains, and the effect is the same. Our Faith is soon told. We raise it on high, and show the ensign on Calvary's mount, waving in glorious splendour, the sure guide for a blinded and ignorant world. We fear nothing. You cannot assail us, but through a breach, if you can make one, in the attributes of our God. "He is of one mind and none can turn Him." He has sworn by himself, that, "unto Him *every knee* shall bow, *every tongue* shall swear; surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, *to Him shall come*, and all that are incensed against Him shall be ashamed." The declaration of the Son of God confirms the promise. "No man *cometh unto the Father*, but *by me*."

We conclude, by advising Mr. Boswell to believe that religion or doctrine, which teaches, that *every tongue* shall swear, and say, "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." And to extend his charity to all who shall have "righteousness and strength *in the Lord*!"

CONTROVERSIAL.

In presenting our readers with the following trial of Mr. E. Elwall, for heresy and blasphemy, at Stafford Assizes, (Eng.) which occurred in the year 1726, we comply with the request of a number of our subscribers.

The bitter spirit of persecution was successfully opposed by the honesty, frankness and independence of Mr. Elwall, and whether his sentiments be considered correct, or incorrect, every well disposed person will rejoice in his triumph over priestly bigotry and persecution. *Her. of Salvation.*

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

Because so many persons have earnestly desired to read this trial, I have here published a second edition of it, in order to encourage all honest men, who have the eternal law of God on their side, not to fear the faces of priests, who are generally the grand adversaries of liberty and truth; and the bastions and bulwarks of all ceremonies, and absurd doctrines that are in the world.

I do this for the glory of the Most High God, and for the good of all my fellow creatures; that they may obey God, and not man; Christ, and not the pope; the prophets and apostles, and not prelates and priests; and God knoweth this is my sincere desire, that all religion and spiritual things may be perfectly free, neither forced nor hindered; this being the true liberty of the gospel of Jesus Christ, who said, *The kings of the Gentiles exercise authority, but it shall not be so with you.*

About fourteen years ago, I wrote a book entitled "A True Testimony of God and his Sacred Law; being a plain, honest defence of the first commandment of God, against all Trinitarians under heaven, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.*" I lived then at Wolverhampton; in Staffordshire, where my ancestors have lived above eleven hundred years, ever since the Saxons conquered the Britons.

When this book was published, the priests in the country began to rage, especially the priests of Wolverhampton; who had a great hand in the several troubles I underwent. In short, they never ceased till they had procured a large indictment against me at Stafford Assizes; where I felt the power of God, enabling me to speak before a very great number of people; being accused of heresy, &c. But I truly answered as my beloved brother Paul did in his day, viz. "In that way which some call heresy, so choose I to serve the God of my fathers, believing all that is written in the law and the prophets."

After the long indictment was read, I was asked if I pleaded guilty or not guilty? I said I was not guilty of any evil, that I knew of, in writing that book; but if they meant whether I wrote the book or not (for they had quoted many pages of the book

in that indictment) I owned I did write it; and that if I might have liberty to speak, I believed I should make it manifest to be the plain truth of God.

Then the judge stood up and said, Mr. Elwall, I suppose "you have had a copy of your indictment?" I told him I had not had any copy of it. Upon which he turned towards the priests, and told them that I ought to have had a copy of it. But they not answering, he turned to me and said, that if I would give bail, and be bound to appear at the next assizes, he would defer my trial till then. But I told him, I would not give bail, neither should any man be bound for me, that if the prince of Wales himself would, he should not; for, said I, I have an innocent breast, and I have injured no man, and therefore I desire no other favour, but that I may have liberty to plead to the indictment myself. Upon which he said, very courteously, you may.

The judge having given me liberty of pleading to the indictment, I began my speech with the sacred first commandment of God, viz. *Thou shalt have no other gods but Me.* I insisted upon the word *me* being a singular, and that it was plain and certain, that God spake of himself, as one single person or being, and not three distinct persons. And that it was manifest, that all the church of God, which then heard these words, understood it in the same plain obvious sense as I do; as is most evident from the words of the prophet Moses, who said to Israel thus: "Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know, that the Lord, he is God, there is none else beside him; out of heaven he made thee hear his voice," &c. I told them, that from the words *he*, and *him*, and *his*, it was certain that God was but one single *he*, or *him*, or *his*. I told them that all the patriarchs from the beginning of the world, did always address themselves to God, as one single being. O thou most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: and Abraham said to the king of Sodom, "I have lifted up my hand unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth," &c. They knew nothing of a trinity, nor of God's being a plurality of persons; that monstrous doctrine was not then born, nor for two thousand years after, till the apostacy and popery began to put up its filthy head.

Then I told them, that all the prophets witnessed to the truth of the same pure, uncorrupted unitarian doctrine of one God, and no other but he; "Have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us?" Then I told them the words of God to Abraham, "I am God Almighty, walk before me, and be thou perfect;" and by the prophet Isaiah, "To whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the holy One," not the holy three. I told them the words *ME*, and *ONE*, did utterly exclude any other persons being God, but that *ONE* single *ME*; and that God himself often testifies the same truth, by saying, "Is there any other God besides me?" and then tells us plainly, "There is no God, I know not any; I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me." Isa. xlv. 5.

Now, said I, let God be true, but every man a liar, that is, every man that contradicteth him; for

he is the God of truth; he says, "I lift my hand to heaven, I say, I live for ever."

After I had pleaded many texts in the Old Testament, I began to enter the New; and told them, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the prophet, like unto Moses, held forth the same doctrine that Moses had done; for when a certain ruler came to ask him which was the first and great commandment, (or how he expounded it) he told him the same words that Moses had said; "Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord," not three, "and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c. and the Scribe said, "Thou hast answered right, for there is but one God, and there is no other but he," &c. Then I mentioned the words of Christ, in the xvii. John, ver. 3, as very remarkable and worthy of all their observation: "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." And then I turned my face directly to the priests, (my prosecutors, who all stood on the right side of the judge) now, said I, since the lips of the blessed Jesus, which always spoke the truth, says, his Father is the only true God; who is he, and who are they that dare set up another, in contradiction to my blessed Lord, who says, his Father is the only true God?

And I stopped here, to see if any of them would answer, but the power of God came over them, so that all their mouths were shut up, and not one of them spake a word. So that I turned about over my left shoulder, and warned the people in the fear of God, not to take their religious sentiments from men, but from God; not from the pope, but from Christ; not from prelates nor priests, but from the prophets and apostles.

And then I turned towards the judge, and told him that I was the more convinced of the truth of what I had said, from the words of my blessed Lord; who said, "call no man Father here upon earth; for one is your Father, even God, and call no man master, for one is your Master, even Christ." From hence, said I, I deduce this natural inference, that in all things that are of a Spiritual nature, we ought to take our religion from God and his prophets, from Christ and his apostles. It will be too long to mention all the texts and proofs that I have made use of; I will only add one or two, as that of Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6, where the apostle tells us, "There is no other God but one; for though there be that are called gods (as there be gods many) both in heaven and earth, but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things;" so that I told them here was a plain demonstration; for he says, there is but one God; and tells us who that one God is, that is, the Father. And therefore no other person could be God but the Father only; and what I had wrote in my book was the plain truth, and founded on God's own words, "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me."

In short, I could plainly perceive there was a general conviction through the court. The judge and the justices of the peace did not like the prosecution; but saw plainly that out of envy the priests had done it. I then began to set before them

the odious nature of that hell-born principle of persecution, and that it was hatched in hell; that it never came from Jesus Christ; that he and his followers were often persecuted themselves, but they never persecuted any; that we had now a very flagrant instance of it by the papists of Thorn, where they first took away the schools where our brethren, the protestants educated their children, then they took away the places of their religious worship; then they put them in prisons; then confiscated their estates, and, last of all, took away their lives.

Now we can cry out loud enough against this, and show the inhumanity, cruelty, and barbarity of it; but, said I, if we, who call ourselves protestants, shall be found acting in the same spirit, against others, the crime will be greater in us than in them, because we have attained to greater degrees of light than they.

However, I told them, that I had put my house in order, and made up my accounts with all men as near as I could; and that as I owed no man here any thing, so I would not pay a penny towards this prosecution. And that I was sure of it, that whatever fine they laid on me, or whatever hole or prison, said I, you thrust me into, I shall find God's living presence with me, as I feel it this day: And so ended my speech.

(To be continued.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

"BE YE RECONCILED TO GOD."

2 Cor. v. 20.

How necessary to our welfare is a right understanding of this passage of scripture! Indeed this persuasion of the apostle may be rendered worse than useless to us, by a misconception of its true meaning. The reader's attention, therefore, is invited to the following remarks, with a hope that by them he will be enabled to profit by the passage at the head of this article.

It is almost a self-evident proposition, that there is much danger of our being unreconciled to God, in the sense of the text, unless we possess a knowledge of his character. We may be reconciled to a character which we suppose the Supreme to possess, and still be as unreconciled to him in reality, yea, perhaps more so, than we ever were before. People who have been supposed to be the best of christians, and who undoubtedly were upright and pious in many respects, may have been as much unreconciled to God as any. It is not intimated that they were not reconciled to the character which they ascribed to the Supreme. This is believed. But the Supreme may not possess the character to which they were reconciled, and therefore, they are not reconciled to him. They may have been further from right than they were before they had formed any definite views of the divine character. For then, although they might not have been reconciled to the true character of God, yet they would not have been to false and injurious views of him. I do not wish to implicate any person in intentional wrong in this matter. People may have made a mistake, but this should be attributed not to their heart, but

their blindness and bigotry, of neither of which they may be in the least conscious. If a man were to be cast upon an island, the inhabitants of which had a natural propensity to think very highly of themselves, and who notwithstanding had always been totally blind, and he were to tell them that by a certain faculty that he possessed, he was enabled to distinguish objects distinctly, work much better, walk with less danger, and serve his fellow men with much more ease and success than they could, they might dispute it, and even proceed to violence in defence of their opinion, but their error could not be attributed to the heart. And so there may be many people who religiously believe that they are reconciled to the true God, and who would think they were very ill treated if it were insinuated that they were not, and who perhaps, under such circumstances, might be governed in a measure by a spirit of hatred, and yet we should cautiously condemn them, nor impute their conduct to bad motives; for they have ever considered themselves to be holy, and have not been habituated to contradiction in this particular.

Yet it behooves us, notwithstanding, to be faithful. For if our fellow men have deceived themselves, it is our duty to tell them of it, and show them wherein, even should we subject ourselves for a few moments to their displeasure.

Now who is that God to which the majority of christian professors are reconciled? What are his actions? What is his character? Is he good, impartially good; or is he malignant, revengeful, cruel? Let us adopt a method to determine which will secure our opponents from misrepresentation, and ourselves from mistake. Let us examine their own doctrines, in which they have set forth the character of their own God, to whom they say they are reconciled. This God has created the human race, the smaller part of them for eternal glory, the greater for eternal torment. By an irrevocable decree he has fixed their fate. Millions and millions of creatures who at his own will he brought into being, will, in the bitterest anguish for ever plead for that mercy which he for ever will deny them. And he is not of such a character as to be dishonoured by such conduct. No, this is his glory; to him and those who are reconciled to him it is the perfection of rectitude and goodness. It is to this God that many at this day are reconciled—they worship him—they say they love him, and desire to dwell with and praise him for ever. They are now setting forth the attributes of this God, exhorting us to be reconciled to him, and threatening us with a fate which according to their doctrine is already unavoidable, if we are not soon reconciled.

Now the important question arises, Are those people who are reconciled to this God, reconciled to the Being who is good to *all* the creatures he has made, and whose tender mercies are over all his works? We would press this question upon the mind of the reader. Is it a possible thing? On the other hand, is he who is reconciled to the Being of impartial goodness and mercy, reconciled to such a character as the wisdom of this world has ascribed

to the Supreme? In the American revolution, those that were reconciled to the government of the mother country, were not to the revolt of the colonies, neither were those who approved of the government of Britain. If we are reconciled to the conduct of a parent who feeds and clothes a part of his children only, leaving the rest to perish, and if we approve of this conduct, we cannot justify a man who should rule impartially, and mercifully provide for all his children. The God which the psalmist David worshipped is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works, as David informs us. Ezekiel says, that the ways of this God are equal. Jesus, according to his own testimony, and that of the apostle John, was sent by his Father, to be the "Saviour of the world." Paul says, that God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Now I ask any person who is reconciled to the Supreme Being here spoken of, whether he approves the conduct or loves the character of that furious being whose glory is augmented by the endless torment of human creatures? He answers me, No. Now we can know with an equal degree of certainty, that those who are reconciled to the latter, are not to the former being.

We must not attribute their reconciliation to this being, to any natural depravity of their hearts, for they are driven to it by the fear of endless torment. They have been taught to believe, that unless they were reconciled to Him, he would torment them for ever, and notwithstanding the task has been arduous and painful, they have attempted it. Those who are fully reconciled to this Being, tell us that they love him, that they shall dwell with him for ever, and that their joy, like his honour and glory, will be increased by the misery of the reprobates. The conduct of many of them corresponds in a great degree with the character of the Being to whom they are reconciled.

How many deceived, pitiable beings are there who are tormented day and night in the worship of such a Being as we have spoken of? They believe that many of their relatives, among whom, perhaps, there may be an own son or daughter, father or mother, brother or sister, who will be the victims of his eternal displeasure. The thought is at first distressing. But they subdue all their sympathetic affections; for say they, "we ought to be reconciled to it, if it is God's will."

We ought to state for ever, in justice to some of those who profess to be reconciled to this being, that a distinction obtains between them and those who are in fact reconciled to him. Some are reconciled to him, because his character is congenial with their feelings. Believing themselves to be the elected favourites of God, they wish his decrees to be true, not so much because he hath formed and declared them, as because they exalt them above many whose eternal torment they will delight for ever to behold. But others are opposed in spirit to such things, and it is with much hard labour that they bring themselves into a state of mind they call reconciliation to God. And this they never would do, did not the clergy continually threaten them

with endless torment if they did not. But the anguish which continually preys upon them, shows that they are not in fact reconciled to the being, although they hypocritically (and yet I would almost say innocently) pretend to be.

But reconciliation to the true God, consists in a love of his character—his impartiality and universal goodness; a love of our fellow men; a submission and acquiescence in all his dispensations, with a belief that they are designed for the ultimate good of all men, an upright life, and a habitual reverence of the divine character. Let us all endeavour to cultivate this frame of mind, and then we shall have obeyed the apostle's requisition, "Be ye reconciled to God."

From the Herald of Salvation.

The following correspondence, between Br. William Worrall, of Glasgow, (Scotland) and Br. S. R. Smith, of New-Hartford, will be read with interest. It will show that the bright beams of eternal truth, accompanied by the holy influence of God's tender, unbounded mercy, are penetrating the deepest, thickest mists of superstition and ignorance, and shedding the broad light of unclouded mental day on the benighted nations of the earth, in confirmation of the sacred testimony, that "the isles shall wait for the law" of the Son of God—"of the increase of whose government and peace, there shall be no end."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

New-Hartford, Dec. 13, 1822.

Dear Sir—I transmit to you a copy of the following letter, from a brother of the Abrahamic faith, and ministry, in Glasgow, Scotland, with a hope that you will give it a place in the "Herald." It will show that truth will flourish in the most ungenial soil—will find its way to the heart in defiance of ecclesiastical restrictions or establishments, and will in due time, be known, admired, and received, to the everlasting joy of all men, and the glory of God.

S. R. SMITH.

EXTRACT.

"Dear Sir—Having formerly written to Doctor Strong, and received no answer, I take the present opportunity of a friend's departure hence, to send you a few lines, expressive of the desire of a worshipping congregation here, professing belief in God's universal love, that a correspondence for mutual information, should be established with brethren on your side the Atlantic. There are three congregations of Universalists in this country—the one over which your humble correspondent has been called to preside, during the infirmity and debility of Mr. Douglass, the original pastor, consists of about 180 members, besides stated hearers; the other two, about thirty members each, besides hearers. Owing to the very sudden departure of the bearer of this, I have not time to write what I wish. You must consider this, therefore, as merely introductory, and we shall anxiously wait your answer, in which, if you could favour us with some particulars respecting the late Mr. Elhanan Winchester, from the time he last landed in America, with the

time, and manner of his decease, and also, with respect to his wife; whether she became, as we hear, truly a convert to Christ. The reason why I ask these particulars, is, because our brethren are desirous that Mr. W.'s life should be republished, and there remains a blank, during the period alluded to. We correspond regularly with the remains of his congregation in London, but for want of a public speaker of talent and education, their numbers are greatly diminished. The desire for scriptural knowledge seems to be increasing amongst us, and we trust we have the blessing of the Lord of the harvest. We have heard that there are in America, several able ministers of the everlasting gospel; and that a Mr. Ballou of Boston, has in his writings, done great justice to the doctrines of the restoration. Were there any means of conveyance, we should be glad to be furnished with this publication and Murray's sketches of sermons. We shall be happy to be informed of the state of religion, and the progress of liberal opinions amongst you, and any particulars which you may think interesting. And wishing you all prosperity in the diffusion of the gospel of the blessed God,"

"I am, Sir, your truly affectionate brother
in the Lord, WILLIAM WORRALL.

"Glasgow, July 31, 1822.

"To Mr. Smith, New-Hartford, }
Oneida county, New-York." }

THE ANSWER.

New-Hartford, Oneida Co. (N. Y.) Dec. 12, 1822.

Dear Sir—Your letter, dated July 31, of the present year, was duly received from the hand of its bearer; for which, I beg you will receive my grateful acknowledgments. A wish for the mutual interchange, not only of information, but of friendly and Christian feeling, have ever been felt by those of the Universal faith in this country, who were acquainted with the fact, that there were those of like "precious faith" in yours. But we knew of no person or name, whom we could address; nor indeed, of any place whither we could transmit our communications to a society, except London. By your goodness, all these inconveniencies are superseded, and I avail myself of the privilege, of making an early reply to your letter. Of the late Mr. E. Winchester's history, from the time to which you advert, or of the remains of his family, I can give you no particular information, as there is nothing like a regular account published; and he had finished his mortal labours and cares, before I entered upon the stage of action.

I trust, however, that the information desired can be easily obtained from the brother, who ministers to the flock gathered by Mr. W. in the city of Hartford, Connecticut, at which place he died. I will endeavour to interest the brother alluded to, (Richard Carrique,) to furnish you, at an early period, with every thing that can be collected on the subject. I apprehend no essential inconvenience, in the transmission of the works of Mr. Murray, and others which you express a wish to obtain. And here, I would observe, that the labours of Mr. Bal-

lou have not been confined to a single publication. The work to which you allude, is no doubt a "treatise on atonement," the doctrinal soundness of which, will be more and more esteemed, as freedom of inquiry, and liberal sentiments prevail among men. His publications of a controversial nature, are emphatic evidences of the immense superiority of the truth of the general system of Universalism, which he has advocated. Others have published defences of the doctrine of the restitution, though none have written so voluminously. Besides the works above alluded to, we have at this time eight periodical publications—four in New-England, in as many different states—one in Philadelphia—and three in the state of New-York. Several of these are published weekly—others semi-weekly—one monthly, and one quarterly; furnishing means of instruction, to those who by their distance from any place of worship, or other circumstances, are prevented from attendance on preaching—and indeed, giving to every class and denomination of readers, an opportunity of judging for themselves. I think it may be safely estimated, that not less than *ten thousand* copies of these different papers, are subscribed for, and in constant circulation in the United States—and there is no state, district, or section of country, where they are not more or less known and read. Their effects are realized to be two-fold; they prevent the introduction and spread of partial and unworthy sentiments of God and his salvation; and they establish the knowledge of him who is "good unto all," and confirm the faith of "the restitution of all things."

From the number of public papers devoted to the propagation of our sentiments, you will naturally infer, the number of believers must be respectable. We have in the fellowship of the "General Convention of Universalists," and its several branches or "associations," about *one hundred and twenty* preachers, several of whom are respectable for their scientific and literary attainments, and most of them men of good information and sound preaching talents—all of them ready to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason of *their* hope, and instrumental in the establishment of the truth of God. I am not in possession of any certain data, whence to estimate the number of separate societies, but think I may safely say, there are more than *two hundred* in the United States. In the state of New-York, there are at least *seventy*. The number of members is very different in different societies; some societies consisting of hundreds, and others of not more than fifteen or twenty. The circumstances of these societies are extremely various, some having houses of public worship, others none. Some stated and regular meetings, while others are destitute of a regular ministry, but most of them increasing in number and influence. Nor is the number of regular societies, the criterion of estimating the number of believers in the doctrine of universal purity and happiness. Many are *scattered abroad*, in single families, or under circumstances which absolutely forbid their personal fellowship with any

congregation of believers; and still more perhaps, *secretly* enjoying our faith and hopes, who are *visibly* connected with other denominations of professing Christians. From these brief particulars, you learn "the state of religion, and the progress of liberal opinions" amongst us in general, and will deduce from them the following fact in particular. In this section of New-York, where we now reckon more than *sixty* societies, there was not a single congregation or preacher, twenty years since.

Here I remark, that in my estimation *real* religion progresses in exactly the ratio, that *liberal* feelings and opinions are cherished. For the entire history of man furnishes but a few distant and solitary instances of enlarged benevolence, and the daily practice of "pure religion and undefiled before God," where the mind and feelings were fettered by the restrictions of antichristian creeds, governed by the senseless formalities of enthusiasm and superstition, or narrowed by *partial* views of a *partial* God. With us then, to have rational and liberal sentiments, is to have a more comprehensive moral sense—a more chastened and lively devotion to God—a more pure and expanded philanthropy, and a more circumspect regard to our words and actions. And thus, while our views and practices correspond, our *feelings* are alike distant from the apathy of indifference, and the phrenzied fervour of enthusiasm. I would by no means insinuate, that there are no examples of amiable virtue and piety among limitarians, or that Universalists are always what their sentiments naturally inspire; but that limited sentiments generally, contract the affections, and tend to vitiate the morals, while on the contrary, liberal views conduce to moral improvement and virtue. Investigation here is *fearless*; for the period of religious spite, and the domination of an exclusive creed have past away. Hence the arrogance of *orthodoxy* is often mortified with queries which it never answers, and its claims rejected because it furnishes not a *reason* for making them—and hence too, our numbers and influence are progressing, not with the rashness of passion, but with scripture proofs deduced by reason. Should you here inquire, whether with this general liberty of thought and discussion, Universalists perfectly agree in every peculiarity of doctrine—I answer, no! They embrace a variety of sentiments mutually converging in the ultimate purity and felicity of mankind. It is this single and exalted truth, which constitutes the criterion of fellowship—that *central* power, which by strong attraction draws a countless multitude with one consent, to the exercise of "one mind." With differently constituted minds, we think it quite enough to harmonize in the simple restoration of all men; and while we claim the right of private judgment, yield with full consent this prerogative of nature to all others. And I am fully persuaded, that stronger evidence of the dereliction of the spirit, and power of Universalism, cannot be found, than in the assumption of exclusive truth in every particular of our faith. Where the Scriptures are read, and man has liberty to examine them—where liberal views can be taught; there the

truth will prevail—there its "rest will be glorious." And every step is permanent in the enlargement of her empire—circle embracing circle, in the strong ligaments of divine love, the era must approximate when knowledge, life, and peace, shall pour their united comforts on all mankind. When every barrier to the progress of intellect shall be broken down—when clerical usurpation shall no longer prevent or restrain research—when inquiry shall be chastened by judgment, and religion, opening a rich prospect of a happy immortality, shall instruct man to be happy now, by aiding him "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God."

Your letters, and those of other brethren, will not only be gratefully received, but considered means of instruction, and tokens of esteem; and should you be pleased to extend your correspondence in this country, I would refer you to the following brethren: Br. Russell Streeter, Portland, Maine; Br. Paul Dean, and Br. Hosea Ballou, Boston, Massachusetts; Br. Richard Carrique, Hartford city, Connecticut; Br. Edward Mitchell, City of New-York, and Br. Abner Kneeland, City of Philadelphia.

The expression of your Christian affection, is most cordially reciprocated—and I pray you will present the assurance of my respect to Mr. Douglass—I wish him and yourself, useful and happy lives, continued while life can yield enjoyment, and reviewed with the consolation, that "the pleasure of the Lord *has prospered* in your hands."

I am your Brother in the gospel of Christ,

STEPHEN R. SMITH.

Mr. William Worrall,

No. 102, Argyle-street, Glasgow.

RELIGIOUS STOCK JOBBERS.

There appears to be about the same finesse and cunning in the religious, that there is in the civil world. Means are invented and resorted to, for the more certain attainment of the one thing needful, the *cash*! Hopes and fears, are introduced as phantoms to work upon the parties concerned, and benefit the sly gentry who sit behind the curtain; and finger the wires as their avarice and cupidity may direct. These holy (i. e. in their own estimation holy) parsons, and their coadjutors, have a grace of their own getting up, in funds, and vary the state of the market as their whims and caprices shall determine. They deal in every thing but reason, argument, and common sense. They are continually besieging the public with their offers and solicitations, and telling of the great bargains to be made, provided you will listen to them, and the great losses you must sustain, by neglecting their advice and assistance.

The better to illustrate and expose the duplicity of these religious cunning ones, we introduce the following simile. A. possessed immense property, and millions of children. A. dying, bequeathed by *will* (testament,) his immense property to his children. A.'s children have but very imperfect knowledge of their father's will, and know very little of the amount or quality of the legacies devised them.

B. with much pretence of friendship and solicitude, comes to the children as a messenger charged with the administration of the will, or testament, and exhorts the children to try and *obtain an interest in their father's will!* Informs them of the dreadful consequences which will attend their neglect of this important duty. Points them to himself as a person qualified to assist in procuring for them an interest in the will, without which, they can never obtain the property of their father, but will suffer excruciating miseries. The infatuated children, ignorant of their father's character, and not knowing that his will is irrevocable, and the legacies secure, give heed to the delusions of the deceiver, and wander in poverty, while they are heirs to a rich inheritance. Reader, the will is the Testament of your Heavenly Father, sealed with the blood of Christ, the only true Administrator. "This is the record that God hath *given to us* eternal life, and this life is *in his Son.*" Spurn from you these deceivers, who deny the record of your Father—substitute a forged will, and strive to cheat you of your inheritance. Christ is the only acknowledged executor of the will. You have an interest in it; and hell—all the enemies of Christ and his cross, can never deprive you of it. Your title is as sure as God is sure!

MILKING THE GOATS.

We extract the following from a missionary work published in this city. It is expressive of the spirit of delusion on the one hand, and hypocrisy and deception on the other. So long as these reverend gentlemen can deceive the public, and convince men of their importance in the religious world, in saving souls, so long they will ride upon the backs of the people. It is an infallible mark of a hypocrite, to impose burdens upon others, which the party is not willing to share himself. These pious folks encourage selling of ashes, wearing cowhide shoes, dispensing with neck-cloths, abridging customary recreations, and buying no wine, in others, that they may riot in abundance, and strut the true *nabobs* of the land.

"In the number of this paper for January, a small donation, being the avails of ashes sold, was acknowledged. The following is the letter (understood to have been written by a Cartman) in which that donation was enclosed. By being read to one and another, this letter has produced a number of donations of the avails of ashes, &c. and it is published in hope that the example may be more generally followed.

"*New-York, 2d January, 1828.*

"MR. J. D. KEESE,

"Dear Sir—I have been trying for a long time to do something for your Society; but as I can't make money, nor earn more than I want for my family, I have at length concluded to sell my ashes, and send you the avails, which I now enclose, six shillings. This you will please to give to the Treasurer. I should be glad to give you more, but my poverty forbids: and it would be a source of great pleasure to me, if every body would give their ashes to this

blessed cause; it would bring a great many dollars into your funds, and enable you to do much good. If I was a merchant, I would give at least a part of the profits of some snug bargains; or a thriving mechanic, and then a part of the profits of some good job," &c.

"Yours respectfully,

"*A Friend to Domestic Missions.*"

DOCTOR CUMMING'S SERMON.

The Rev. Dr. Hooper Cumming has published his Introductory Sermon, delivered in the Church in Vandewater-street. Dr. C. is, by *profession*, a Calvinist. Dr. C. rejects the Hopkinsian doctrine as absurd. But, when Dr. C. preaches, he is by turns a Calvinist, a Hopkinsian; and, notwithstanding his blood boils at the thought, sometimes an *Arminian!* And, sometimes, reader, he is unintelligible, so far as doctrinal points are in question! The Doctor's Sermon is an outline of his creed. He, however, kept back a part. Universalism, as the truth is now called, received his unqualified abhorrence. Dr. C. incorporated with his sermon, a part of his *Vade-Mecum*, published at Albany; and afforded, thereby, an opportunity to explain his principles more at large, by a reference to that book. We purpose to devote our next Number to a Review of the Doctor's Sermon, for the accommodation of his admirers, who will thereby be benefited by a knowledge of Dr. C.'s principles, and learn, at large, his ideas of total depravity, and the difference between a *saint* and a *sinner*. They will also be enabled to discover the great errors of the inspired writers, who, according to him, require more of man than is necessary; but now, with the assistance of Dr. C.'s qualifications, men can be holy, and repent, with very little cost or trouble.

Those of our friends who may wish a few extra copies of the Number containing the Review of Dr. C.'s Sermon, at cost, will please signify the same, at the office, 67 Chrystie-street, before Tuesday next.

On Wednesday, the 4th June, Br. David Pickering was installed over the First Universalist Society, in Providence, (R. I.)—Br. John Bisbee, Jr. preached the sermon. Brs. Dean, Killam, and Fuller, were also present, and took part in the services.

Agreeably to our friend's request, from Trenton, we shall shortly publish Mr. Boswell's eleven Articles of his new faith, &c.

NEW CHURCH.

The Corner Stone of the New Church, now building by the "Second Society of United Christian Friends" in this city, on the corner of Prince and Orange streets, will be laid on Monday afternoon next, at five o'clock. An Address will be delivered by Br. Edward Mitchell, Pastor of the "First Society of United Christian Friends in this city."

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1823.

NO. 9.

REVIEW

Of a Book, entitled "THE ESSENTIAL DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL: AN INTRODUCTORY SERMON, delivered in the Presbyterian Church in Vandewater-street, in the city of New-York, on the Morning of Sabbath, June 1, 1823. By HOOPER CUMMING, D. D. Pastor of said Church. Published by request of the Church and Congregation. NEW-YORK, PRINTED BY J. SEYMOUR, 49 John-street. 1823." 18mo. pp. 27.

It is proper for us to state, for the information of the Church in Vandewater-street, that Dr. Cumming, during his pilgrimage at Albany, published a book, entitled "*The Christian's Vade-Mecum*." Our motive for this is the following—Dr. Cumming has quoted from his *Vade-Mecum*, and given the Church in Vandewater-street, a part of that work in the guise of an introductory Sermon; thereby authorizing us, in our review of the Sermon, to notice the *Vade-Mecum* also. We shall do this the more readily on account of the advantages to result to Dr. C. and his *new* charge—the Doctor's powers as a logician will be more brilliantly exhibited, and his *new* people the sooner initiated into his *lucid mysteries*, and his extraordinary system of *grace and morality* combined! Farther, we now state, once for all, that we have nothing to do with, or to say of, Hooper Cumming. The Reverend Doctor Hooper Cumming, author of the "*Vade-Mecum*," and an Introductory Sermon," containing "*The Essential Doctrines of the Gospel*," is the character we are about to analyze. His secular character, person, and concerns, we neither know nor care any thing about, any farther than to wish him reputation and happiness. But, of the Reverend Doctor we have much to say, as follows—

On the first day of June, (it being the first day of the week,) the Reverend Doctor Cumming preached an Introductory Sermon in the Church in Vandewater-street, from these words—

"*Wo is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel.*"

1 Cor. ix. 16.

We cannot well refrain from expressing our surprise at the choosing a sentiment and declaration so *mal à propos* to the Doctor. Reader, if it should peradventure be that you are a member of the Church in Vandewater-street, will you please to recollect that there is a greater than Dr. Cumming; that a possibility exists of your being in error, and still a stranger to Christ's gospel? Christ both visited, and eat and drank with publicans and sinners. Imitate your divine Lord, and, however vile you may regard those who profess their belief in the sal-

vation of all men, condescend, for once, to hear a despised believer in this despised doctrine, speak for himself, and defend his faith against the accusations of the Reverend Doctor Hooper Cumming. Be not unmeasurably offended, when we say, we are of opinion, that the words, "*Wo is unto me, if I preach not the gospel*," come with a very ill grace from the mouth of a man who is to receive *two thousand five hundred dollars* per annum for preaching his gospel! We have a strange presentiment, that the *wo* most dreaded is the loss of the *cash*! That the *wo*, let it be what it may, would be braved, were the \$2,500 kept in the back ground! The Reverend Doctor Paul, this does not sound well, Paul, the servant of Christ, whose salary was paid in imprisonments, in perils, in watching, in hungering, in thirsting, and in stripes, could lay his hand on an honest heart, and, with devotion and humility, say,

"*Wo is unto me, if I preach not the gospel.*"

How many persons, having families to support, in the Congregation worshipping in Vandewater-street, have an income of \$2,500 per annum? Paul, the author of the text, would not be a burden to those who received the gospel at his hands. Look again at the "*Wo*,"—look at the circumstances of the people—look at the House they meet in—a Congregation, in a pecuniary point of view, poor, and in debt, and a Pastor draining their purses, and saying—

"*Wo is unto me, if I preach not the gospel.*"

Paul, you would have been ashamed of this! If all we have written is a digression, the reader, if he is a Christian, will pardon it.

Dr. Cumming's exordium is deserving of some notice. He says, if not found doing his duty, &c. "*ten thousand curses will fall on my devoted head.*" As Dr. C. deals very largely in curses, we are not surprised; and shall not object in many words, as he has made himself the recipient of them. We only ask, Is this gospel? The Dr., we presume, considers 10,000 as a sacred number. In his *Vade-Mecum*, p. 159, he says, "*The word of God declares unequivocally, in ten thousand instances, that there is an eternal hell.*" Now the Doctor, although called upon, a long time since, has not, to this day, produced the passage in the word of God, where it is declared in so much as *one* instance, "*that there is an eternal hell*!" If he has a curse for *every* hell he has palmed upon the sacred word of God, his number is well chosen! Dr. C. asks, in p. 7. "*How infinitely more aggravated will be his doom, if from the pulpit he publish error, than if he did not profess to be an ambassador of Christ!*" And adds, "*The field of legal science had opened to him the*

prospect of *wealth* and *honours*; but at the call, as he humbly trusts, of his divine Lord, he felt it his imperious duty to abandon worldly occupations," &c. "*Wo is me.*" *Two thousand five hundred dollars per annum!* We recommend to Dr. C. to drop egotism altogether! It will not do. Vandewater-street is rather dark, but some of his audience can see in twilight!

Dr. C. also says, p. 7. "If he should fail to preach the *true gospel*," &c. "through eternity, he would sink under the wrath of an Almighty God." We ask, Does the true gospel declare this? Dr. C. acknowledges, that "The *literal* meaning of the word gospel, is *glad tidings*." What is the *spiritual* meaning? Is it different? Dr. C. says, "He who preaches the *gospel*, brings *glad tidings* to a ruined world." We heartily subscribe to this. This is, indeed, the truth. But, look at this—Behold, I bring you *glad tidings* of *great joy*, the *few elect* shall be saved, and a large portion of the "ruined world," shall be consigned to "an *eternal hell*!" If this is *glad tidings*, *sad tidings* would consign men to *endless felicity*!

In p. 8, Dr. C. says, "If I do not declare *all the counsel of God*—if I do not explain," &c. "the leading and essential doctrines of salvation, a *wo* awaits me." Please to explain Isa. xlv. 20—25. Ephes. i. 9, 10. Rev. iv. 11. Is a vociferous harping of *damnation*, and forging Scripture, impiously charging God with having "declared in *ten thousand instances*," that which God has never spoken, "explaining the leading and essential doctrines of *salvation*?" Christ says, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Dr. C. declares, "No portion of the divine record can be separated from the rest, without defacing the beauty of the entire structure." We caution him to beware of a denial, in practice, of this, his own assertion. We know of no greater impiety, than solemn mockery in the pulpit. Adding to the Book, and taking from the Book, in solemn grimace, is a species of pious fraud, abominable beyond description. Whether Dr. C. has been guilty of this, in an aggravated degree, his conscience shall judge; and the people of his charge can judge also. Remember, "God is not mocked." Prejudices may be fostered, and mankind deceived, but the deception will return upon the head of the offender. If there is any spirit more devilish than another, and farther removed from every thing that comports with the christian character, it is *pride*! Pride will lead to falsehood, to prevarication, and will unblushingly bear false witness against our neighbour. Spiritual pride is the crime of devils.

We earnestly request the reader to bear in mind, that Dr. C.'s Sermon purports to exhibit the "Essential doctrines of the Gospel." That he has admitted the truth; that the meaning of the word gospel, is "*glad tidings*." Therefore, any thing advanced, at any time, inconsistent with *glad tidings*, is not a doctrine of the *gospel*!

In p. 9, Dr. C. introduces, what he calls, "those truths *essential to salvation*," &c. The first is,

"The existence of '*one only* living and true God.'" Dr. C. proceeds to enumerate his attributes; and, after stating the existence of God to be eternal, his wisdom infinite, his power almighty, and his holiness such as not to look upon sin without abhorrence, &c. says, "*so just*, as to resolve on evincing to the universe his hatred of it, by pouring *eternal vengeance* on impenitent transgressors." Is this gospel? We read in the Scriptures of the "*day of vengeance*:" but never of "God's resolve to pour *eternal vengeance* on transgressors." To Dr. C. we say, Sir, recollect the—"Wo is me!" Dr. C., however, says not one word of God's *goodness*! A prophet says, "Praise the Lord, [What for?] for he is *good*, [What evidence have we of his goodness?] for his *mercy endureth for ever*." Dr. C. did make out to say, that God is "*so merciful*, through Christ, as to save from perdition so many of his rebellious subjects as he can save consistently with the *designs* of his moral government." Is this gospel? Is there a passage in the whole Bible, any thing like it? Paul, (see Ephesians i. 9, 10.) says, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, *even in him*." But Dr. C. will not admit Paul's testimony. Dr. C.'s god, and Paul's God, differ in their designs! We caution with a sincerity and good will which is not purchased with a salary of \$2500, Dr. C.'s congregation, not to trust in a god whose designs are different from the God Paul worshipped.

"Again," Dr. C. says, "He who would approve himself as a true and faithful minister, *must* teach the doctrine of a *trinity of persons in the Godhead*." Is this gospel? What shall we say of all the prophets, apostles and disciples of God, and his Son Jesus Christ? Not one of them ever taught "the doctrine of a *trinity of persons in the Godhead*." According to Dr. C. they were neither true nor faithful! The word *person* occurs but once in the whole Scriptures, as applicable to God, and is a false translation! Dr. C. has varied his exhibition of his trinity, from that given in his Vade-Mecum. He retains a part, however. He acknowledges in his Sermon, p. 10. that it is "a profound *mystery*." But, though like other mysteries, it can neither be fully comprehended nor explained, it is still a truth." How do you know this? If it is a *mystery*, (*secret*, something *unknown*, for this is the meaning of the word rendered *mystery*;) how did you find it out? How can you believe that, of which you are ignorant? Dr. C. continues—"And what the Scriptures *reveal* concerning it, ought *clearly* to be exhibited." Pray, how can a thing or principle be a *mystery*, after the Scriptures have *revealed* it? What have the Scriptures revealed of this acknowledged *mystery*? Why, Dr. C. says, "They teach, that such is the mode of the divine existence, as to make it proper for God, when speaking of himself, to use the personal pronouns; I, Thou, He. This it is which lays the foundation for what the advocates of the

doctrine, term a trinity of persons in the Godhead." Is this Gospel? O, No. What is it? Ask Dr. C. It is the doctrine of the Trinity. Do the Scriptures teach it? Why no. But the Scriptures teach—what? Not what Dr. C. advances. He has given his *ipse dixit*. What is it worth? Nothing! The Scriptures do speak of God, as having *hands*. Shall we then conclude, that he has a human body? No! For God is a *Spirit*. Dr. C. shall be gratified. The personal pronouns have a *direct* application to man. Answer, Do you contain *three persons*? The Dr. continues, "By which [the trinity] it is not meant, as has been unjustly asserted by the opposers of this truth, that there are three *beings* in one *being*. But the term *person* is necessarily used on account of the poverty of our language, for want of a better term, to signify that peculiar manner of the divine existence which the Scriptures *clearly* teach." Look at this. A trinity of *persons* must be taught. Then follows the acknowledgment that the term *persons* is a *poor* term. By which we understand is meant an *imperfect* term. Is this Gospel?

Dr. C. and his admirers shall not have just cause to accuse us of misconstruction. The Doctor shall have fair play. We therefore give his more full account of this doctrine, as contained in his *Vade-Mecum*, pp. 9, 10. "The doctrine is confessedly *mysterious*. We can neither *comprehend* nor *explain* it. No deduction of *reason* will establish—no similitudes will *elucidate* it. It is a truth purely of revelation, and it claims our credence on the authority of 'Thus saith the Lord.'

"By the doctrine of the Trinity, we mean not as its enemies allege, that there are three *Beings* in one *Being*. That were a palpable absurdity. But we mean there are three *persons* in one *Being*, necessarily using the word *person* for want of a better term, to signify that peculiar mode of the divine existence which the Scriptures *clearly* teach. Such is the mysterious and incomprehensible manner in which the Divine Being exists, as to lay a proper foundation in his nature, to speak of himself in the first, second, and third person, and say, I, Thou, He, meaning only himself." We turn to page 12, and read, of this mysterious and *incomprehensible* doctrine, that "The evidences are so multifarious, so *lucid*, so *energetic*, that it really is surprising, that any who are not avowed deists should be anti-trinitarians." Astonishing language this! "We mean not," says the Doctor, "as its enemies allege, that there are three *beings* in one *being*. That were a palpable absurdity. But we mean that there are three *persons* in one *Being*." Well, then there are *two* of your three *persons* who have *no being*! A wonderful trinity this! *Personality without being*, and each of these persons almighty in power, infinite in wisdom, &c. and at the same time have *no being*! This is arriving at a just conclusion. For it proves that the modern hypothesis of a trinity of persons is false! There never was poor man more completely confuted by his own deductions, than Doctor Cumming. A humble acknowledgment that his hypothesis is a creature of the imagination.

Look again at Dr. C.'s conclusions. In p. 11. of

his Sermon, he contends, that his *three persons* must be distinctly God, or he could not confide in them. Well, so be it. The Dr. has furnished a rule; let us apply it. *Two* of these three persons have *no being*. How, then, can you confide in a person who has *no being*? Where there is no being, there is no *reality*; and thus dies the doctrine, or, more properly, Dr. C.'s persons, by his own weapon. Paul, speaking of God, says, "Who only hath *immortality*." Dr. C.'s two persons have *no being*, and to talk of immortality where there is no being to possess it, would be nonsense. The Dr.'s difficulties can be solved or removed in a moment. We read, "God was in *Christ*, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Again, "God is a *Spirit*." Here is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in the person of Jesus Christ. This is clearly taught. Dr. C. pretends there is a "Thus saith the Lord," to support his hypothesis. Let him name the chapter and verse if he can! Alas! for diplomas and pretensions. What do bubbles avail, when Truth, like a whirlwind, appears, sweeping error from his hiding place, and destroying the refuge of lies!

Dr. C. pp. 11, 12, introduces his essential doctrine of the atonement, of the Son of God, as he terms it. He asserts, that a "vicarious sacrifice" is "the only basis on which we may build our expectations of life eternal." And declares, "The public teacher who denies this truth—who disallows the necessity of a real substitution, and proposes any other method of escape from threatened punishment, is, to all intents, an *infidel*." This is neither gospel, scripture, nor argument. A man of any foundation whatever for his pretensions, we think, would be ashamed to make this declaration before an audience of children; to say nothing of adults, or men of any wisdom or science! How puerile! Alas! is this man a Reverend Doctor! Does he call this *Gospel*! How charitable! But this is the manner of this great logician. We *pity* the man; we are astonished that an audience of men of sense can be found, who will patiently listen to such miserable *talking*; for we can call it by nothing better. These are the *husks* of Calvinism. The Gospel proclaims the "bread of God, which came down from heaven and giveth life unto the *world*." (Not a few elect.) The Gospel the servants of Christ preached, is "the Spirit which giveth life." They declare, "I would have you know that the Head of *every* man is Christ." Instead of a *vicarious* sacrifice, they represent mankind as being *associated with Christ*, their divine head, in his crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension. Christ declared—"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all unto me." The law threatens no punishment beyond this life. Every man suffers the consequences of his sins.

Page 13, Dr. C. decides that all men are sinners. That the faithful minister "will 'conclude all under sin,' and insist that every individual on earth *needs* essentially the application of atoning blood." Dr. C. thus commits himself, and disparages his faith. As a Calvinist, he restricts the application to a few. But,

remember, *all need it!* What a reflection this, upon the Creator of men!

Alas! alas! alas! for the Reverend Doctor Hooper Cumming. If he were totally insane, he could not have outraged common sense more than he has done in p. 13, where he discourses on the *total depravity* of man; as follows—"How a really good man can deny the doctrine of total depravity, when he understands the import of the expression, I cannot possibly conceive. Sure I am, that when he looks at his *own* heart, and beholds the depth of pollution into which it is sunk, he will feel no hesitancy to admit, that 'in him, that is, in his flesh,' in his carnal, unconverted nature, 'there dwelleth no good thing.'" What! a good man *totally* depraved? The Vade-Mecum throws some light on this subject. The reader will please to recollect, that it is the Rev. Dr. C. who is speaking—Vade-Mecum, p. 47. "By the doctrine of *total* depravity, we do not mean, that men are as wicked as they *possibly could be*." So we suppose, by *total* darkness, we do not mean that it is as *dark* as it possibly could be! Page 54, "Whoever undertakes to describe a *sinner* without taking *total* depravity into his character, will describe a saint. If he say, a sinner is one who *sometimes* does good, and *sometimes* does evil, this is a description of a saint. For every saint *sometimes* does evil. If he say, a sinner is one who does *more evil* than good; this is a description of a saint. **FOR EVERY SAINT HAS MORE SIN THAN HOLINESS.** If he say, a sinner is one who has the *lowest* degree of grace; this is a description of a saint. For the *least* degree of love, *faith*, *repentance*," [i.e. we suppose, if you repent of only *one-tenth part of one sin*.] "or any other holy affection, forms the character of the saint, and *entitles him* to the divine favour." This is Dr. C.'s account of *total* depravity! The righteous and the wicked, according to Dr. C. are as different as sin and transgression! But, more of this in its proper place. The Doctor's crude opinions will start up like the ghosts of his departed senses, and trouble him *wo-*fully before we have done with his Sermon. "*Wo is me*," says Dr. C. "if I preach not the *gospel*;" and the "*wo*" will be to him: verifying the declaration, "The way of the transgressor is *hard*."

The Dr. continues, p. 13, "Again: Are sinners in their natural state, entirely destitute of holiness, then, in order to the inheritance of heaven, they need the *special and regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit*." Page 14, "If heavenly enjoyments are holy in their nature, a sinner must be created after the *image of God* in righteousness, before he can possibly be happy in heaven." The Doctor's Sermon is only an outline; the Vade-Mecum is a *finished* production, and explains all. In page 56 of that work, we read as follows—"We may argue the same doctrine from the general tenor of the *threatenings* of Scripture. These are so constructed as to exclude none from heaven but those who are utterly destitute of holiness. 'If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ, [*at all*] let him be Anathema Maran-atha.' 1 Cor. xvi. 22. "Follow—holiness,

without which, [without some degree of which] no man shall see the Lord.' Heb. xii. 14. 'Except ye *repent* [*in some degree*] ye shall all likewise perish.' Luke xiii. 3. 'He that *believeth not*, [*at all*] shall be damned.' Mark xvi. 16."

An easy way to go to heaven this. But, we ask Dr. C. and his admirers, What kind of a gospel is this? What have you for a god; and what is his spirit; his image? Is a man in the "*image of God*," when he *loves* "*at all*?" Do "the special and regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit," produce only "*some degree* of holiness?" "*Some degree*" of repentance? A *little* faith? And has your holy man, who it fitted and entitled to heaven, "*more sin than holiness*?" We ask you, Sir, in plain terms, Are not you ashamed of thus perverting the Scriptures, and finding an excuse for sin? What your society in Albany were about, to have these abominable sentiments made public, through the medium of the press, and they co-partners in the honour and credit of the production, we know not. We tell you, Sir, that your *saints* are no better than our *sinners*. The characters you send to heaven, are the very characters we believe are in hell.

Dr. C. in p. 15, declares of *good works*, "When it is ascertained what constitutes an action *good*, there can be no difficulty nor danger in admitting, that *actions* of this nature, are in one sense, *essential* to salvation." In p. 20, Dr. C. enumerates crimes, and names some persons whom he considers to have been great sinners, and says, "The friend of God would rather be excused from associating with such company. If there be no difference between the lot of the righteous and that of the wicked, why believe in Christ? Why love God?" This savours of the ancient Pharisees, who accused Christ of eating with publicans and sinners. Look at this, and compare it with the above—page 16, "If salvation be of *grace*, *God may*, without the least injustice, bestow this salvation *on whom*, and on no more than *he pleases* to deliver from the curse." Now, if God may do this, where is the ground of Dr. C.'s objection to let a worse man than *himself* go to heaven? He has decided that God may bestow salvation on whom he pleases, without the *least injustice*! In p. 14, Dr. C. declares, "The *entire work* of man's salvation is of *grace*." In p. 16, speaking of the christian, "He depends exclusively on the *merits* of Christ for pardon and life eternal." In p. 14, he declares of the atonement by Christ, "The grand, the prominent design of that vicarious offering, was to evince to all intelligent creatures, the determination of God to support the authority of his moral law," &c. and "here the *atonement stops*." Does it? Ask the humble Paul, the servant of Christ, where the atonement *stops*! Paul, raise thy arm, covered with stripes, the reward of thy toil, and speak. Let thy voice be heard, in this day of clerical pride and corruption. Paul, what sayest thou? Ans. "It pleased the *Father* that in him should all fulness dwell; and having *made peace* through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all things unto himself*; by him, *I say*, whether *they be* things on earth, or things in heaven."

Col. i. 19, 20. "If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; *much more*, being reconciled, we shall be *saved* by his life." Rom. v. 10. "For *all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being *justified* freely by *his grace*, [not our *faith*] through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." iii. 23, 24. We ask Dr. C. Is this gospel? If it is, that which you preach, is *not* gospel, and "*ten thousand curses*" await you, on your own confession! We tell Dr. C. and the people of his charge, This is *Gospel*. This is *glad tidings*; and *wo-betide* the wretch, who dares pervert it! You may find a majority of the *world* on your side. But, remember, and we speak it with solemnity, God is on the side of Christ and the Bible!

Again. See your inconsistency. You declare, p. 16, of the Christian, "he depends exclusively on the *merits of Christ*, for salvation." What! when the merits of the atonement of Christ *stop* short, and leave the work *half done*! We are not to be deceived with common place remarks. The suavity of Dr. C. in glossing his Sermon over with contradictory sentiments, and fine spun expressions of humanity, holiness, love, &c. are of no avail. Dr. C. is accountable for his energetic declarations, and cunning admissions and conclusions. We array his absurdities and perversions in proper order before his face, and marshal them, in all their deformity, before the people of his charge; we open the Sacred Book, and appealing to a higher Source than synods, presbyters, and human creeds and confessions, demand, not only a respectful attention, but, an answer.

Doctor C.'s Sermon abounds with his assurances that he "will preach the *whole truth*." Will he, did he ever preach the *whole truth* to any audience, uncontaminated with the traditions of men? Will he preach the truth, that "Christ tasted death for every man?" That "The kingdoms of *this world* shall become the kingdoms of our God, and of his Christ?" That God has "sworn by himself, that unto him *every* knee shall bow, *every* tongue shall swear, surely shall say, *In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, to Him shall come*, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed?" Is it declaring the *whole truth*, to say, "That men *cannot* be admitted to heaven without complying in the *present world*, with the terms of the gospel?" (p. 18.) That "*every saint has more sin than holiness*?" That there is *no change nor alteration after this life*? [Vade-Mecum.] We pause—What kind of *saints* are these? Has Dr. C. "*more sin than holiness*?" Will he experience no change hereafter? We verily think the *vile* characters and persons he has enumerated, on his own confession, would not be unfit company for him, however his pride might object to the association! We ask, Has that man complied, in the present world, with the terms of the gospel, who has "*more sin than holiness*?" Who "*has repented in some degree*?" Who "*loves the Lord Jesus Christ at all*?" Who "*believeth at all*?" We do not, Pharisee-like, thank God that we are not like other men; but we do rejoice, and

express our thanks, when we reflect, that no preacher of God's Universal love and goodness, was ever left to declare such abominable sentiments, to advocate such wicked principles! Our arm may be nerved with vengeance, and point a dagger to the bosom of a fellow worm, and better this, than the "*tongue to be set on fire of hell*," and utter falsehood of the character and purposes of the Great, the Holy, and the only wise God! You may call us "*lying Universalists*;" and subjoin every epithet which slander can devise, but we will never sanction principles which outrage reason and common sense, and contradict the revelation of the King of Heaven.

Dr. C. shall have justice done him. He limits the atonement even in its *efficacy*. Strange to relate, he uses the words *Holy Ghost*, and *fear of hell*, as convertible terms. Something is necessary besides the atonement, to save sinners. What is it? In his Sermon, Dr. C. says, "the Holy Ghost must employ his omnipotent energies," &c. (Query. Was not this done, when "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself?" Was not an Omnipotent energy employed *then*?) In his Vade-Mecum, p. 171, Dr. C. says, "tens of thousands, already in heaven, *could not have been converted*, for they were dead to every other motive, while the *fear of hell ALONE* was, in the *first case, influential*." Here the *fear of hell*, has more omnipotent energies ascribed to it, than the Holy Ghost! Nay, the fear of *hell* is possessed of an efficacy superiour to the atonement! Reader, this is not Universalism. This is Dr. C.'s gospel!

Dr. C. p. 19 of his Sermon, introduces a large quotation from his Vade-Mecum, pp. 142, 143. Notwithstanding we furnished Dr. C. with a declaration of our sentiments, and assured him of his mistake, in ascribing to us such principles, he still persists in wilfully *slandering*, against his better judgment, a portion of the community, whom he has neither *honour, honesty, nor courage*, to meet in fair and impartial discussion. How shall we account for this conduct? Shall we join with him, and say, The *saint* has more sin than holiness, and, in charity, we should expect nothing better? If this will answer, Dr. C. is welcome to the salvo. If it will not do, the Dr. must find another excuse. The quotation follows—

"The man who reads the Scriptures, and is an Universalist, is *not a Christian*. For, he does not believe the testimony of God himself. He either with one section of his party, entertains the most erroneous conceptions of the divine justice—conceptions diametrically opposed to scripture: or imagines that the divine mercy is indiscriminately lavished without regard to the suggestions of wisdom—and with the same class of men, denies the *infinite* evil of sin, representing its future punishment as a temporary purgatory, and not an *eternal hell*: in all these notions, embracing essentially wrong ideas of the divine perfections:—or, with another party, he utterly disclaims the idea of future punishment, and sends immediately after death, without exception, the vilest of the vile, to the rewards of the

righteous—the happiness of heaven. To whichever party he is pleased to attach himself—whether he is inclined to adopt the sentiment of a limited punishment; or no punishment at all, he openly contradicts the whole system, the very tenour of Christianity: he openly contradicts the positive declarations of God who cannot lie. Such a man wishes to quiet his conscience by his delusive hopes. But they are *delusive* hopes—hopes which shall perish, “when God taketh away his soul.”

To this we reply—According to Dr. C., when a *Christian*, a man has “*more sin than holiness!*” Now, Doctor, you shall decide—Have Universalists more *sin* than holiness? If they have, on your own confession, they are Christians, or *saints*. If they have not, but have *more holiness* than *sin*, call them what you please, they are *better* men than yourself! These are conclusions, *generously* furnished you, *gratis*, from your own premises! But, Sir, it remains to be proved, that Universalists “do not believe the testimony of God himself. Your word will not be sufficient authority to substantiate this assertion. Read this—Acts iii. 20, 21. “And he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive [retain] until the TIMES of RESTITUTION of ALL THINGS, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” Sir, Universalists believe this testimony of God. The mouth of all God’s prophets have spoken of the *restitution of all things*, since the world began. The *devil’s* prophets have denied this testimony, and will continue to deny it! To Dr. C. we say, Sir, *tremble*, when you again utter this wicked slander against Universalists, who believe in this, God’s testimony, by all His prophets. Tremble, lest the “*Wo*,” the “*ten thousand curses*,” fall upon your devoted head, and you learn, by sad experience, that “it is an evil and a bitter thing, to sin against God.” We will tell you, Sir, and your *deluded* congregation, what conceptions we entertain of the Divine justice. Look at our conceptions. Read them, not in Calvin’s Institutes, but in the revelation of the word and will of Heaven’s King! “*There is no god else beside Me; [Who?] a JUST GOD and a SAVIOUR.*” Isa. xlv. 21. “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.” Dare you, Sir, say, This is an “*erroneous* conception of Divine justice?” Can you, Sir, say, These conceptions are “*diametrically opposed to Scripture?*” Will you, Sir, presume to say, That the divine mercy is “indiscriminately lavished without regard to the suggestions of wisdom,” when it is bestowed on all those who are “*justified freely by God’s grace?*”

Sir, we do deny the *infinite* evil of sin. The Scriptures, so far from asserting it, deny it also. Saying—“Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the *remainder* of wrath shalt thou restrain.” You, Sir, deny it, in your Vade-Mecum, p. 163, where you say, “The Scriptures, on which we must ultimately depend for all truth, convey to us the *most formidable* ideas of transgression,—com-

paring its consequences to the bite of a serpent, and the sting of an adder.” Sir, answer—If the “*most formidable* ideas contained in the Scriptures, of the consequences of sin, may be compared to the bite of a serpent,” &c. how can you say, that transgression, or sin, is *infinite*? Is the bite of a serpent *infinite*?

Sir, we deny your assertion. We do neither represent the “*future* punishment of sin, as a *temporary* purgatory, nor as an *eternal* hell.” We put you to the task.—The columns of this paper are free. Prove, if you can, the *future* punishment, in another world, of one of Adam’s race, for the sins committed in this. Sir, when even your *saints* have more sin than holiness, it stands you in hand to be careful of *them*! Sin, on your own hypothesis, predominates. Be careful of your *hell*. Guard it well. Your atonement is inefficacious; and your holy spirit, less energetic than the fear of *it*! Do we “send immediately after death, without exception, the vilest of the vile, to the rewards of the righteous—the happiness of heaven?” Sir, the wretch who “has more sin than holiness,” is vile. Where do you send him? The Bible teaches us, that in Christ we “have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.” Farther. “We must all be changed. This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality; and then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting? O GRAVE, where is thy victory?” And, Sir, we know, that the “sting of death is sin,”—that “the strength of sin is the law;” and, with unutterable gratitude, we exclaim—“Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” These, Sir, are our sentiments, or faith. We stand fearless. Our bosom is covered with the “shield of faith,” and we brave, unconcerned, all the darts of the enemy!

You have promised to preach the whole truth. Tell your congregation the word *adn*, rendered *hell*, in Luke xvi. 23. is the same word rendered *grave*, in 1 Cor. xv. 55. Now, Sir, you have, the second time, our sentiments. Beware how you “bear false witness against your neighbour.” Beware how you accuse us of “contradicting the whole system, the tenour of Christianity.” You may know, if you will learn, how we “quiet our consciences.” Are our hopes, founded on the promises and oath of Jehovah, “delusive hopes?” Will “they perish, when God shall take away our soul?” Know, Sir, that “The dust shall return to the earth as it was; and the spirit to God who gave it.”

We tell Dr. C. that we envy not the natural, moral, or spiritual condition of that man, who can declare with him, p. 19, “The doctrine, therefore, which opposes the destructive sentiment of *Universal Salvation*, is an essential part of divine truth—a portion of that truth, my brethren, which I shall feel it my duty to defend and explain, and always openly avow among you. It is so interwoven with all my religious sentiments, that were I to renounce it, I should renounce the whole system of my belief, from the beginning to the end. I would immediately abandon the sacred office in which I have en-

gaged. If all men are to be received to the beatific vision and fruition of God and the Lamb, without respect to their temper and conduct in this life, why should I preach the faith of Christ?"

Was it a spirit of love or hatred, which dictated the above? We give Dr. C. credit for declaring the truth—that, "The doctrine which opposes" the salvation of all men, "is so interwoven with *all* his religious sentiments, that were he to renounce it, he would renounce the *whole system of his belief* from the beginning to the end." We will state the faith of the believer in the salvation of all men; and let Dr. C.'s system appear in contrast. We believe, that it is necessary for man to have the law of God written in his heart, and to love God supremely, and his neighbour (*all* men) as himself. We believe this will be accomplished, "As it is written, They shall be *all* taught of God." And, farther—We believe, and say, "If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ, [*with all his mind, and strength*] let him be Anathema, Maran-atha." 1 Cor. xvi. 22. "Follow holiness, *without which*, [*every degree of holiness*] no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii. 14. "Except ye *repent* [*in every degree*] ye shall all likewise perish." Luke xiii. 3. "He that *believeth not*, [*ALL*] shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. We also believe that it requires the "*greatest* degree of love, faith, repentance, or any other holy affection, to form the character of the saint." Reader, Look at that. Now, Look at this. Dr. C. believes, the "*least* degree of love, faith, repentance, or any other holy affection, forms the character of the saint!" And says, "If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ [*at all*] let him be Anathema Maran-atha." 1 Cor. xvi. 22. 'Follow—holiness, *without which*, [*without some degree of which*] no man shall see the Lord.' Heb. xii. 14. 'Except ye *repent*, [*in some degree*] ye shall all likewise perish.' Luke, xiii. 3. 'He that *believeth not*, [*at all*] shall be damned.'" Mark xvi. 16.

Dr. C.'s whole system, on his own confession, consists in "*believing at all—following some degree of holiness—loving at all—repenting in some degree!!!*" Dr. C. adds—"If all men are to be received to the beatific vision and fruition of God and the Lamb, without respect to their temper and conduct in *this life*, why should I preach the faith of Christ?" (That is, the faith of *Calvin*.) Answer. To obtain *two thousand five hundred dollars per annum*! Stop, Doctor, not too fast. You forget yourself. You have decided, in your Sermon, "If salvation be of *grace*, God may, without the *least injustice*, bestow this salvation on *whom He pleases*," &c. A precious confession this. And now, you would have the "*ignorant*" class of the community believe, that your *salary* is altogether a matter of indifference! Pray, Doctor, where is the mighty difference between *your saints*, and the *sinner*s you despise so much, when their conduct, in *this life*, is viewed through the medium of your "*whole system*"? Your saint, in this life, "*has more sin than holiness*." He "*has the least degree of love, faith, repentance, or any other holy affection*!" If not absolutely *totally* depraved, the distinction is so very

trifling, that even you, Doctor, declare, (*Vade-Mecum*, p. 55.) "It appears from facts, as well as from Scripture, that it is *impossible* to point out any *essential* moral difference between a *sinner* and a *saint*, without making *total depravity* the peculiar and essential character of the sinner." And to make it evident that this is not a slip of the head, heart, or pen, you also declare, p. 54, "If he say, a sinner is one who does *more evil* than good; this is a description of a *saint*. For *every saint* [*Calvinistic saint*, we presume you mean!] *has more sin than holiness*." You do not stop here. You declare, in emphatic terms, that there is no alteration *after death*. Let us look, for a moment, into *your heaven*. And, as your *hell* is in the neighbourhood, we will look at that also. We see no difference in the inhabitants of either place, unless we take your touchstone, Doctor, your *total depravity*, and apply it to the complexion of each. Then we find, that your *holy* men have "*more sin than holiness*." That they possess the *least degree* of love, faith, repentance, or any other holy affection." In fine, to use *your own language*, We find, that "it appears from facts, that it is *impossible* to point out any *essential* moral difference between a *sinner* and a *saint*, without making *total depravity* the *peculiar* and essential character of a sinner." Now, Doctor, this appears very reasonable. For *your saints* are such *abominable wretches*, that you can discover nothing in them to prove a distinction in their favour. You must prove the sinner to be, if possible, a little the *worst* man on the whole, and that establishes the character of the competitor to be a SAINT!!!!!! Doctor, where did you learn all this? Who told you, that the preaching these abominable sentiments would authorize you to speak of being engaged in a "*sacred office*?" How dare you pretend, that you "*preach the faith of Christ*?" Answer—"Doth a fountain send forth at the same place *sweet water and bitter*?" You published your "*Vade-Mecum*," and sent it forth into the world, as a compendium of what you taught and believed to be, the religion of Jesus. A book of "*sound doctrine*." A guide to your parishioners, and a defence of the truth. You have never abjured the sentiments there promulgated. They are, to this moment, your *own*. And when you, in your Sermon, promise to explain, more fully, the "*Essential doctrines of the Gospel*," we are not only authorized but compelled to believe, that your explanations will harmonize with your "*Vade-Mecum*."

We ask you, Sir, What do you mean, when you say, in your Sermon, p. 21, "To explain and enforce the *graces and virtues* of the Christian life, and the obligations by which all men are bound to comply with the divine requirements, shall therefore occupy a large portion of my ministerial exertions?" Do you mean, that the "*graces and virtues of the Christian life*," consist in possessing the "*least degree of love, faith, repentance, or any other holy affection*?" Does that man "*comply* with the divine requirements," who "*believes at all*?" Who is holy in "*some degree*?" Repents in "*some degree*?" Who has "*more sin than holi-*

ness?" Sir, remember, it was well said by you, that "the doctrine therefore, which opposes," what you call, "the *destructive* sentiment of Universal Salvation," &c. "is so interwoven with all your religious sentiments, that were you to renounce it, you would renounce the *whole system of your belief*, from the beginning to the end!" Sir, all men are "to be received to the beatifick vision and fruition of God and of the Lamb, without respect to their temper and conduct in this life!" For, even you have decided, that "if salvation be of *grace*, God may, without the *least injustice*, bestow salvation on whom he pleases," &c. The Scriptures are final on this subject. "Not of *works*, lest any man should boast." You, Sir, call our faith "*destructive*." If you mean destructive by its influence on the mind of men here, it is perfection itself, compared with your hypothesis. You teach, that to be a *saint*, is to possess the "*least degree* of love, faith, repentance," &c. What can be more demoralizing? We teach, That the *greatest degree* of love, faith, and repentance, are indispensable to constitute the christian character. You teach, that sinners may go on with *impunity*. Because if elected they will certainly be saved; and the punishment for sin is in another world, where they will escape it, by finding a safe harbour in heaven. We teach, in the words of inspiration, saying, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*; much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. xi. 31. They shall reap where they sow! You, Sir, must acknowledge, that even your saints, if so wicked as you describe them, can receive, in this life, to the last farthing, the recompense of their "love; faith and repentance." And farther, that sinners can also receive the just demerit of their sins, by "receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet." Rom. i. 27. You also teach, that God will save only a *part* of mankind; and this part a few, leaving the great residue without any incentive to love or gratitude. We teach, (Eph. i. 9, 10.) that God has "made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, *even in him*." We hold out to men the greatest incentives to love and serve God. We represent God, in the language of Inspiration, to be the "God of the spirits of all flesh." We say with Christ—"Call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your *Father* who is in heaven." In fine—We exhort all men to be holy, in every possible degree, for holiness will produce immediate enjoyment. We entreat and persuade men to forsake sin and every evil way, for sin will make them miserable. We urge the consideration of these, by the most powerful motives and incentives in the mind of man. Gratitude to God, who is the Friend, the unchangeable Benefactor of *all*. Whose only purpose in creation, and all his works of providence and redemption, have for their ultimate object the holiness and happiness of his creatures, which will increase the knowledge of his perfec-

tions, and diffuse, throughout the boundless regions of his dominion, his Light, and Life, and Love! These briefly are our sentiments. They will be *yours*, and the sentiments of all men. For the time is coming, "when *all* shall be taught of God." When "*all* shall know him from the least to the greatest." And the prophet declares, "They that *know* thy name, will put their trust in thee."

Before concluding, we would call Dr. C.'s attention to the following declaration, in his Sermon, p. 26. "But when my mind reverts to another view of my ministry, it is filled with solemnity and awe. That ministry will exert an influence the most important upon every member of this congregation throughout eternal ages. Every action we perform—every prayer we offer—every spiritual privilege we enjoy, will affect our everlasting destinies. *Oh, press not through the river of Christ's blood to the flames of hell!!!*" We ask you, Sir, where is your authority for giving yourself so much consequence, and predicating such tremendous consequences upon your preaching? How can your declaration be truth, if what you declared in pp. 17, 18, be true, that God "is resolved to preserve them, [the elect] and to conduct them to his everlasting kingdom?" Did God resolve to do this, with the condition of your assistance? If not, your labours will never secure the salvation of one soul. If the non-elect are reprobated, as you believe, in the counsels of eternity, your preaching will not kindle one flame in hell, nor prolong, for a single moment, their sufferings! We also ask you, Sir, where you learned, that a man could "*press through the river of Christ's blood to the flames of hell?*" We read, "The blood of Christ cleanseth from *all sin*." And some of your brethren in your faith have declared, that "*one drop* was sufficient to save a guilty world." How then is it, that a man can be washed in a *river* of the atoning blood of Christ, and leave its cleansing current, guilty and vile, borne on its crimson waves to the flames of hell?

Note.—To Dr. Cumming we say, our columns are *free*. If you feel aggrieved, you have a remedy. But, you must not expect too much from men whom you style "*utterly ignorant*," &c.

THE DUTY OF CARING FOR THE SOULS OF RELATIVES.

The above is the title of a Tract; in which the duty of saving the souls of relatives is urged. Does God save the souls of *his* relatives? If not, you must not save yours? You must be godly: God is the Father of all men. Is it your duty to save the souls of you cousins and distant relations, and will God neglect to save the souls of his own offspring? Is a God of love, of less compassion than you, a man of the dust? Is all the care and concern expressed by clergymen, for the souls of men, sincere? Or, do not they say *one* thing, and mean another; writing, through mistake, the word *souls*, when their hearts say, *salary*!

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1823.

NO. 10.

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALISTS.

The ministers and delegates composing the Southern Association, convened according to adjournment at the house of Br. Thomas G. Farnsworth, in Stafford, (Con.) on Tuesday the 10th of June, 1823. Commenced the labours of the Session by uniting in solemn and fervent prayer with Br. David Pickering.

BR. HOSEA BALLOU, *Moderator.*

BR. RICHARD CARRIQUE, *Clerk.*

CIRCULAR LETTER.

The ministers and messengers composing the Southern Association, united in Christian fellowship, and enjoying that hope of eternal life, "which God that cannot lie promised before the world began," send Christian salutation to their brethren, possessing like Christian faith, and who, relying on the word of promise, and believing all things written in the law and the prophets, look forward with joy and gladness; beholding with the EYE of faith, that glorious period, when every creature which is in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them shall join in one anthem of grateful praise; singing in the spirit of holy and sincere affection, Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

Beloved Brethren—It has pleased the Lord of the harvest to strengthen the hands of his servants, whom he has called to the work of the gospel ministry, by granting them the pleasing satisfaction of beholding their labours effective of much good, in liberating the mind from the bondage of superstition and bigotry; removing the dark cloud of ignorance, which has long separated men from their God; and enabling them through the knowledge of the truth, to look unto the Creator of all things, as their Father and friend, relying on his promises, trusting in his goodness and mercy.

A goodly number of brethren united in one *faith* and one *hope*, were indulged with the opportunity of meeting together, to consult on those measures best calculated to promote the cause of righteousness and truth; to give energy to them who labour in the vineyard of the gospel; and strength to those, who, having received the testimony of God's universal benevolence, rejoice to behold the Captain of their salvation, going forth a victorious conqueror, subduing all things unto himself; causing the light of divine truth to beam upon the understanding, and the spirit of heaven-born charity to take possession of the hearts of men.

The labours of the session were rendered truly encouraging to those, who are called, like the apostle of the Lamb, to labour and suffer reproach for believing in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, by learning from each other the prosperous state of the churches and societies in fellowship with this association; to hear of their goodly order, their unanimity, harmony and peace, their continued increase in numbers, in faith, and in love. We had the satisfaction of receiving two new societies into fellowship, and also of granting letters to two young brethren, who have renounced the traditions of men; received the gospel of the Lord Jesus in its purity and simplicity, unshackled with creeds of human invention; and who have come forward in behalf of their divine Master, declaring that "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." The high recommendation we received of the moral rectitude, humility, and talents of our young brethren, induces us to believe they will be faithful and useful in the gospel ministry, and to bid them welcome to the joys and pleasures, the trials, crosses, and persecutions which in common with us they will have to encounter and pass through. In the midst of trials they will remember, that the Master whom they serve, endured the bitter persecutions and revilings of men, and notified his servants that they would experience the same. The grace of our God will for ever be found sufficient to support in the midst of trials, and the spirit of universal love, will enable them manfully to fight the good fight of faith, and in meekness to endeavour to instruct those, who, through ignorance, oppose themselves to the gospel of Christ.

The Father of our spirits smiled upon us during the session, granting us a large and attentive audience; giving animation and zeal to those engaged in the songs of the temple; and wisdom and energy to his servants, who enjoy the happy lot of administering the bread and waters of life, feeding the flock of God with the heavenly manna; and refreshing the thirsty soul from the pure chrystal stream of eternal life. Our hearts burned within us when the messengers of peace declared from the divine word that "God is love," and shewed, in the demonstration of the spirit, that the Lord is good, impartially good to all his creatures, and that his tender mercies are over all the works of his hands. Believing that God loved us even when we were dead in sins, and has promised us life in his Son, which promise is confirmed by the oath of Jehovah, we were persuaded to flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us. To hope in God, and to

enjoy all that consolation, peace, and rest, which is the effect of confidence in the divine word of our heavenly Father. And as the believers in that gospel which God preached to Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed;" being turned every one from his iniquities, are every where spoken against, we were invited to enter into a careful examination of the doctrine, as taught by the apostles and primitive Christians, and the reception they met with from the opposers of the gospel. It was ascertained, that the apostles were every where spoken against, persecuted, ill-treated, their preaching misrepresented, and themselves represented as disturbers of the peace, and the corrupters of the morals of mankind. But even in that stage of prejudice and darkness, there were some found whose honesty and love of truth induced them to inquire of the apostles themselves, respecting the doctrines they taught. From this fact the following useful lessons were impressed upon the mind, that the best and surest way to obtain a correct knowledge of the sentiments embraced by any particular sect of men, is to go to them for information, and not to the enemies and opposers of their sentiments, who from sinister motives might be induced grossly to misrepresent their system of faith; which in the most clear and lucid manner was shown to be the case, with those who oppose the doctrine of universal benevolence, who most cruelly and wickedly misrepresent the doctrine; and say, that we believe in certain things, which we condemn and reject, as inconsistent and absurd.

Fully persuaded, that iniquity abounds with many who verily believe, that by opposing those who differ from them in religious sentiments, they are doing God service, and who have adopted the popish doctrine, that the end sanctifies the means; our minds were prepared to enter into the investigation of the causes which produced those effects. It was shown by convincing and incontrovertible proof, that men in all ages have endeavoured to imitate the God whom they worshipped, and that the characters of men were generally formed, according to the views they entertained of their God. When men behold the Almighty as a sovereign tyrant, implacable and cruel; revengeful, passionate, and unjust; deceiving his offspring with promises of life, when he means their eternal ruin; expressing a willingness that all men should be saved, while he has a *secret, determined, and irrevocable WILL*, that a certain portion should suffer his wrath for ever and ever; they being transformed into the image of this God, practise those cruelties and deceptions, which they suppose him to perform towards men; and consider themselves as possessing all religion and piety, while they are violating those heavenly virtues contained in the religion of Jesus.

Our public services closed with the solemn and important services of ordaining, and setting apart a brother to the important duties of the gospel ministry. The candidate, and his brother labourers in the vineyard of God, were sensibly impressed with the truth of the declaration, made by St. Paul, that

we ought not to preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ the Lord, and to consider ourselves the servants of the people for Jesus's sake. That we ought ever to preach Christ, as he was preached by the prophets of old. As the promised seed, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. As the finisher of sin; the bruiser of the serpent's head; and as the King of Zion, who must reign until he hath subdued all things unto himself, and reconciled all things to God. That we preach Jesus as he preached himself; the way, the truth, and the life. The Saviour of the world, and the RESTORER of men to holiness and to happiness.

In the midst of our joys, we found cause for regret and heart-felt sorrow, being called upon to notice certain publications, laid before the public by brethren in the fellowship of this association, which, we fear, has a tendency to dissolve the bond of union, which has so long happily existed: to give the enemy an opportunity for triumph; and to wound the feelings of the lovers of truth and righteousness. We earnestly hope, and indulge ourselves in the belief, that the cloud which has interrupted our felicity will be but transient and of momentary duration. That the all piercing rays of the sun of LOVE will dissolve the cloud, and that the spirit of divine benevolence and fraternal affection, will disperse every deleterious particle, that poisons the cup of blessing, and destroys fellowship among brethren. We beseech you brethren, believers with us in the faith of Abraham, in the name of the God and Father of our spirits, that ye live together in love. Let no trifling peculiarities of religious opinion break your fellowship with one another. While each one considers it his privilege and right to think for himself on the important concerns of religion, and to determine according to the evidences he receives from the divine testimony, as to points of doctrine, yet let each consider, that others enjoy the same privileges in common with himself. Let us then, as believers in the ultimate restitution of all things (or all men) to holiness and happiness, obey the golden rule, by doing unto others, as we would that they should do unto us. Let the divine and glorious hope of meeting each other, and the whole family of mankind, in the kingdom of peace and eternal enjoyment, keep alive in our hearts the power of love, unite us in all the energies of brotherly affection, and enable us to live in fellowship, and in the faithful discharge of every moral obligation: that we may put to silence the gainsaying of the enemy, and as labourers together in one common cause, spread the joyful tidings of peace and salvation among the children of men, gladdening their hearts with the hope of eternal life.

Brethren, we commend you to God, and the word of his grace; devoutly praying, that you may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour by well ordered lives and conversation; that you may enjoy divine consolation in the hour of death, and at last be received into glory.

Per Order,

R. CARRIQUE.
Hartford Religious Inquirer.

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

(Concluded from page 60.)

After I had ended my speech, a justice of the peace, one Rupert Humpatch, got up, went to the judge, laid his hand upon the judge's shoulder, and said, My lord, I know this man to be an honest man; and what I say, I speak not by hearsay, but experience; for I was his next door neighbour three years. Also another justice spoke to the same effect. Then the judge spoke to me: "Mr. Elwall, I perceive you have studied very deeply into this controversy; but have you ever consulted any of our reverend clergy, and bishops of the church of England? I answered, yes, I have; and among others, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, with whom I have exchanged ten letters, viz. four I have had from him, and six he has had from me. [At which words, all the priests stared very earnestly.] Well, says the judge, and was not the archbishop able to give you some satisfaction in these points, Mr. Elwall? I said no; but rather quite the reverse; for that in all the letters I sent the archbishop, I grounded my arguments upon the word of God and his prophets, Christ and his apostles; but in his answers to me, he referred me to acts of parliament, and declarations of state, &c. whereas I told the bishop, in one of my letters, that I wondered a man of his natural and acquired abilities, should be so weak as to turn me over to human authorities, in things of a divine nature; for though in all things that are of a temporal nature, and concern the civil society, "I will be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; even from the king upon the throne, down to the meanest officer in the land; but in things that are of a spiritual nature, and concern my faith, my worship of God, and future state, I would 'call no man father here upon earth,' nor regard either popes or councils, prelates or priests of any denomination, nor convocations, nor assemblies of divines; but obey God and his prophets, Christ and his apostles." Upon which the judge answered, Well, if his Grace of Canterbury was not able to give you satisfaction, Mr. Elwall, I believe I shall not; and so sat down and rested him, for I think he had stood up for near an hour and a quarter.

Then he stood up again, and turning to the priests, talked softly to them. I did not hear what he said, or what they said to him; but I guessed from what the judge said next; for, says he, Mr. Elwall, you cannot but be sensible that what you have writ, being contrary to the commonly received doctrines of the church, it has given offence to some of your neighbours, and particularly to the clergy; are you willing to promise, before the face of the country here, that you will not write any more on this head? I answered, God forbid that I should make thee any such promise; for when I wrote this book, I did it in the fear of God; and I did not write it to please the church of Rome, nor the church of England, nor the church of Scotland; but to please that God who gave me my breath; and therefore, if at any time I find myself drawn forth to write in defence of this sacred first commandment, or any of

the ten, I hope I shall do it in the same spirit of sincerity as I have done this. And I perceived the judge was not in any wise displeased at my honest, plain, and bold answer, but rather his heart seemed to be knit in love to me; and he soon declared me acquitted: and the clerk of the arraigns, or assizes, stood up, and said, Mr. Elwall you are acquitted; you may go out of court when you please.

So I went away through a very great crowd of people (for it was thought there was a thousand people at the trial) and having spoken long I was athirst, so I went to a well and drank. Then went out of town by a river-side, and looking about and seeing no one near, I kneeled down on the bank of the river and sent up my thank offering to that good God who had delivered me out of their hands.

By the time that I returned to the town, the court was up and gone to dinner; a justice of peace and another person met me, and would have me eat and drink with them, which I did; and afterwards as I was walking along the street, some persons hove up a great sash-window, and invited me up to them, and when I entered the room, I found ten or a dozen persons, most of them justices of the peace, and amongst them a priest, whom they called Doctor. One of the justices took me by the hand, and said, Mr. Elwall, I am heartily glad to see you, and I was glad to hear you bear your testimony so boldly as you did. Yea, says another justice, and I was glad to see Mr. Elwall come off with flying colours as he did.

Upon which the priest said (in a very bitter manner) "He ought to have been hanged." I turned unto him, and said, Friend, I perceive "thou dost not know what spirit thou art of: for the Son of man came not to destroy, but to save," but thou wouldest have me destroyed. Upon which one of the justices said, "How now, Doctor, did not you hear one of the justices say, that he was an honest man, and that what he said, was not by hearsay, but by experience, and would have an honest man hanged, Doctor? Is this good doctrine?" So that the priest said but little more for some time.

So I took leave of the justices, and took horse for Wolverhampton, for I knew there would be great joy in my family, for the common people all expected to hear of my being fined and imprisoned. But a farmer that lived near, who had been upon the jury at Stafford got to town before me, and the people went all up and asked him, what have they done to Mr. Elwall? Have they put him in prison? He answered "no, he preached there an hour together, and our parsons could say never a word. What must they put him in prison for? I told our foreman of the jury, Mr. Elwall was an honest man, and his father was an honest man, I knew him very well." So they were all damped. But there was great joy in my family, and amongst all my friends. Praises, living praises be attributed to that good God who delivered me out of their hands!

Christ never told us of that scandalous popish invention, of his human nature praying to his divine nature: but, like a true obedient son of God, submitted to death, even that cruel death which the ha-

tred and envy of persecuting wicked priests inflicted on him, because he had so plainly and truly told them their blindness, covetousness, pride and hypocrisy. And therefore God raised him from the dead; and for his faithfulness, God has exalted him to be a prince and a Saviour to all those that obey that pure doctrine which God gave him to teach; that denying ungodliness and sinful lusts, we should live soberly and righteously in this world. Then we are his disciples indeed, when we do those things that he hath commanded. Then shall we be saved, not by the merits of Christ, that is another popish invention; for he never did any thing but what was his duty to do, and therefore could not merit any thing for others; but he taught us the true way to find acceptance with God, and that was by "doing the will of his Father which is in heaven; and therein he is the way, the truth, and the life, because no one cometh unto the Father, but by that way."

Neither did he make satisfaction unto God for us. It was impossible; and what God never required: but "he who had no pleasure in the death of sinners, but rather that they should turn from their wickedness and live," out of the immutable height and depth of his love, directed our Lord Jesus Christ to teach mankind a never failing way of being reconciled to God, and that was by sincere repentance and reformation. This was the gospel or good tidings of Jesus Christ, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He tells us, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance;" and by that beautiful excellent parable of the prodigal son, he illustrates the tender mercy of his God, and our God, of his Father and our Father, without any satisfaction. The compassionate Father required none at all, but humble confession and submission, with sincere repentance, and reformation, and then comes the "best robe, the ring, the shoes and fatted calf;" to demonstrate the paternal acceptance without satisfaction or sacrifice, "but a broken and contrite heart which he will never refuse;" for he can as soon cease to be God, as cease to be merciful.

And as to the Trinitarians, nothing is more plain, than that they feed upon ashes; "a deceived heart hath turned them aside, because they will not make use of those rational faculties which God hath given them; nor say, 'Is there not a lie in my right hand?'" otherwise they would never flatter the humble Jesus, nor make the most High God to be a plurality of persons.

For as to the Holy Ghost (their third God) it is evidently no distinct person from God, any more than a man's spirit is a distinct person from the man; so that the spirit of God is God's spirit; as is manifest from scripture and reason, Gen. vi. 3. "My spirit shall not always strive with man—And the spirit of God moved on the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light. And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. And God made all things by the word of his power." So that the word of God and the spirit of God, are not distinct persons from God. So the word of a man and the spirit of a man, are

not distinct persons from the man, but the man himself; if his word be false, or his spirit be wicked, the man is false and wicked.

The same degree of stupidity that leads Trinitarians to call the word of God, and the spirit of God, distinct persons, would lead them to call the wisdom of God, the goodness of God, the love of God, the peace of God, the power of God, and the mercy of God, distinct persons; and make God to be a trinity of trinities: for it is certain, God is expressly called by those names.

But whoever goes about to father this absurd and horrid doctrine of the Trinity upon Jesus Christ, does egregiously abuse him; who told us plainly, "his Father was greater than he; and that he could do nothing of himself," which is a demonstration that he is not God: for we are sure God is omnipotent, and can do all things of himself;—being self-existent, and independent, the supreme Creator of the universe; and in this it is, that the Unitarians triumph as unanswerable, believing in Jesus Christ, who told us his Father was "the only true God." John xvii. 3. By these last words of Christ, I myself was convinced many years ago.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY CONSIDERED,

IN REFERENCE TO DR. CUMMING'S OPINIONS, &c.

The limits of a single Number not admitting of an extensive view and examination of the modern hypothesis of three *persons* in one *being*, we purpose, with the present opportunity, to show the absurdity and falsehood of this popular Polytheism more fully. The advocates of this hypothesis, aware that the Scriptures nowhere avow a *plurality* of existence in the Deity, save in one passage, which is an acknowledged interpolation, endeavour to support it on the supposition of evidence being found in the Scriptures where the "personal pronouns *I, Thou, and He*, are used by the Deity when speaking of Himself." In our last Number we stated, that "personal pronouns have a *direct* application to man." But, we say, that to the Deity, their application must, of necessity, be *indirect*. God has "spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets." It is the mouth of *man*, who speaks of God. Now the sticklers for this hypothesis, knowing full well the *unity* of God, and the cloud of witnesses which prove it, acknowledge the *unity* of God; and, strange to relate, call those infidels, deists, and atheists, who will not admit and believe that *one* is *three*, and *three* are *ONE*!

Dr. Cumming, in a moment of abstraction from Calvinism we presume, committed himself, and introduced a species of argument against himself, the most irresistible that can be imagined. He has admitted for truth, one of the greatest truths which the mind of any man can conceive, namely—that the idea of *three BEINGS* existing in *one BEING*, would be a palpable absurdity. It would. It would be the greatest absurdity. For there is but *ONE Being* in the universe; and that Being is *GOD*. As saith the Scriptures, "*In Him* we live, move, and have our being." Will Dr. C. pause—recollect, and

gather his scattered senses, and remember, that *being* and *existence* are one! We read, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Can you give without communicating? No! The Father, then, hath communicated *existence* and *being* to the Son. Now read the declaration of the "Mediator between God and man, who is the man Christ Jesus." "Because I live, ye shall live also." Then, when this takes place, *existence*, *being*, &c. will be communicated to man in the aggregate. You may now see the meaning of the declaration, "that God may be *all in all*." God is *existence* or *being*. When God is *all*, (or *all God* is) in *all*, then immortality will be *man's*. Transporting thought! Death, where now is thy sting? Grave, hell, all the horrors and terrors of blinded man, where art thou now, where is thy victory? I fear thee not. I am allied to Omnipotence! My bosom is steeled with the being of Jehovah; and my life, is the existence of my Father God! There never lived the man, whose eyes were opened to see his affinity with God, through the Mediator, the *link* in the chain that binds man to heaven, whose bosom could tremble in view of all the horrors which a miserable priestcraft has engendered in darkness, and hatched in the cave of superstition. No! "They who put their trust in the Lord, shall be as mount Zion, which cannot be removed." When Jehovah is destroyed, they are destroyed, and never till then! Their mouth speaks what the abundance of the heart dictates—"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea!"

Again: Bring forward your "personal pronouns," and let them dwindle in the presence of the following testimony—"But I would have you know, that the *Head of every man* is *Christ*; and the head of the *woman* is the *man*; and the *Head of Christ* is *God*." 1 Cor. xi. 3. There is the same affinity between Christ and every man, as between the woman and the man. This is the figure. And you will please to remember, The Head of the *whole*, of Christ, is *GOD*! Behold, ALL creation in UNITY! A body, whose Head is God. The members all men. "God, *all in all*." Then, astonishing thought! The Godhead will dwell with, and be in all men, bodily. For "God will be *all in all*."

Reader, you have seen a single cloud, borne aloft on purest æther, swimming on the splendid bosom of a summer's sky. It has melted in your vision,—left the blue expanse of heaven without a spot. So clear is the mental heaven of Truth, where God resides. So melts and disappears the traditions of man; leaving the vast expanse a splendid concave, an ocean of light, without an intervening mist to dim the believer's eye. God is the "God of the *spirits* of all flesh;" and "God is a *Spirit*." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;" "God is the Head of Christ;" and "Christ the Head of every man!" If you believe this, you believe your destiny is in the hands of your Father.

Confide in your Father, for your Father is God, and "GOD IS LOVE."

Note—We feel on this subject, as we should feel, and experience the same sensations which we should experience, were we to stand under the canopy of heaven at noon-day, and in the full blaze of a meridian sun, produce arguments to prove that it is day, and not night!

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.
NATURAL MAN AGAIN.

It will be recollected that man, in this state of existence, is a compound being. The Scriptures speak of a "mortal body, a new man in Jesus Christ," and of an "old man which is corrupt;" these two distinct men tabernacle in the mortal body. This mortal body, taken in the abstract, is as sinless as a tree or any inanimate substance, it may be merely the instrument of righteousness or unrighteousness, accordingly as it is actuated by an inward principle. "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof: neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. Every sin that a man doeth, is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body."

The new man in Jesus Christ, the new creature, the man in the image of God, the heavenly man, &c. are appellations which unquestionably mean one thing. This new man taken in the abstract, is holy, just, and good. "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not. Little children let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God."

Man of sin, son of perdition, natural man, unrighteous, wicked, &c. are appellations, which, without doubt, mean one thing; this man of sin, taken in the abstract, is unholy and entirely unclean. "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh," &c. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. vi. 3. 5. Reader, you now see what man was, by nature, without the Spirit of God. Do you see any thing good in him? "God is a Spirit." And it is THIS spirit which constitutes "man in Jesus Christ." It is this Spirit which constitutes the immortal spirit. And, it is this Spirit that constitutes the immortal soul! Strip the compound man of this, and you make a mere devil of him. Look at Psalm xiv. 1—3. and Psalm lviii. 1—6. there you will see, God looks down from heaven upon the children of men, natural men in the ABSTRACT; did you ever behold a more cursed character? Can you behold the least particle of good in them? Mr. Editor, where is your good natural man now? How can

men be children of wrath by *nature*, if, as you say, they are only so by *practice*? You often quote the following passage, "without natural affection." If the affections are *good*, they are not the productions of the natural man, because, you must recollect there is a "*divine nature*," as well as an *earthly nature*. "And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is none good but one, that is God.*"

In the following passages there are *seeming* contradictions; but they are easily reconciled. "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not."—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." In the first of these passages, the compound man is meant; in the second, the new man in Christ Jesus, taken abstractedly, is meant. Again. "It is appointed unto man once to die."—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." In the first of these, the compound man is meant, in the second, the new man in Jesus Christ, abstractedly. Again. "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb," &c. The natural man in the abstract worships the beast; the new man in Christ Jesus worships God. The natural man's name, in the abstract, never was written in the Lamb's book of life. The new man's name was always written there.

That these various appellations mean the spirit of the devil, and that they *are* the devil, I have no doubt; such as—the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts—man of sin—natural man, &c. Reader, take particular notice of the following passages. "He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. In this, the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." "Behold, the devil shall east some of you into prison." How does the *devil* put people in prison? Answer—By a wicked persecuting spirit, which is found in every zealot. This spirit is the old corrupt man, or in other words the devil. "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them." The circumstance of the sons of God, and Satan among them, means compound men, that is, the mortal body, man in the image of God, &c. "And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth," &c. The idea, of the Lord and Satan talking so freely together, signifies a bad spirit, examined by a good spirit, or in other words, the self-examination of a compound man. Satan's "going to and fro in the earth," signifies the roving, meddling disposition of the wicked thoughts and imaginations of the old man, which is the devil. Satan finding so much fault with Job, signifies the envious, malicious dispositions of people towards their rich or virtuous neighbours. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." UNIVERSALIST.

Remarks in our next Number.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—Sometime past I heard a Sermon delivered by Dr. Griffin, from Luke xii. 16–20, from which he attempted to establish, as a truth, a *future* state of *never-ending* misery to finally impenitent sinners. In other words, all who die in unbelief. Among many other bold assertions, in his truly eloquent harangue, I noticed in particular the following expression—"Many who are now within the sound of my voice, will wish they had been in *perdition* long before they had heard this Sermon." I have now before me Mr. Hosea Ballou's excellent "Notes on the Parables." I am sorry he has not noticed the passage in question. Your sentiments on the same will gratify and very much oblige yours,

With high esteem and love.

D. R.

Newark (N. J.) July, 1823.

LUKE XII. 16–20.

"And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully. And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, *Thou fool*, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?"

This parable unquestionably had a primary application to the Israelitish nation. We consider the *goods* spoken of to be the same as the Gospel privileges which the Jews enjoyed during the preaching of Christ, which are alluded to in Matt. xxi. 43, "Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." By *night*, we understand the close of the Jewish economy. The same as is expressed in the parable of the virgins, Matt. xxv. The Jews were those who laid up treasures for themselves, and were not rich towards God. "Whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Ans. The Gentiles.

We have no objection, whatever, to consider this parable as having a direct application to every man under heaven. For, although its primary application was to the Pharisees of old, we think it will apply quite as well to modern Pharisees, whose faces, prayers, and pretensions, are quite as long as their prototypes. The exhortation of Christ, immediately following this parable, is a terrible reproof to our pious Doctor's of Divinity. Christ says, "Therefore I say unto you, [his disciples] Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on," &c. Our pious Doctor's, however, of all men, love the *cash*, and are anxiously engaged in procuring *fat beef—fine clothes—and fine houses*. Dr. Griffin would do well to face about, and look at the sums he has expended in *holy* luxury, and *pious* extravagance! To consider whether he has not laid up goods in his barns, and solaced himself with the riches and honours of the world, instead of the humble service and

charities of the meek and lowly christian. We would respectfully caution him, not to heat his hell more than is requisite to suit his *own* temperament and feelings!

There is one particular, however, which deserves special notice. Dr. Griffin is well acquainted with *Hell*. This is nothing new. In a sermon he preached sometime ago, he declared, that "*he saw*" some of his hearers in the hell he is continually harping about. It appears now, that "*perdition*" itself, (by which the Dr. means fire and brimstone for ever) is preferable to hearing *his preaching*. We will agree with him so far as this, that to a sensible, honest, humane person, something very disagreeable would seem quite as well as the Pharisaic rant, and absurd and wicked declarations which so often escape his lips in the pulpit. To us, we frankly declare, few things are more disagreeable, than the seeing a pampered, proud Pharisee, swelling with pride and conceit, taking his Maker's name in vain, swearing *piously* in the pulpit, and damning endlessly, with hellish satisfaction, and a demon's rage, *his brethren*, whom he is bound to love as himself. To these descendants in principle and practice, of the ancient Pharisees, we apply the Saviour's words—"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

From the Edinburgh Christian Instructor.

PATRICK HAMILTON,

THE FIRST SCOTTISH REFORMER.

This gentleman was of royal descent; a circumstance, in Providence, that was subservient to raise more attention to his excellent doctrine, holy life, and patient suffering. He possessed a most amiable disposition, and was well educated. He was very early made abbot of Ferne, with a view to his being one day more highly preferred. At the age of twenty-three, he, with three companions, travelled into Germany in pursuit of religious knowledge, and coming into Wittenburgh, he met with Luther and Melancthon, with whom he held frequent and close conference, and by whom he was well instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel. He grew daily in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus, and being well established in the faith, and much improved in all useful learning, he returned with one of his companions to Scotland, desirous to impart the knowledge of the true religion to his countrymen. With this view he began to preach the Gospel of Jesus, with great fervency and boldness, and to lay open the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome. This soon alarmed the whole body of the clergy, and particularly James Beaton, arch-bishop of St. Andrews, where, after several days conference, he was dismissed, Beaton seeming to approve of his doctrine, and acknowledging that many things wanted reformation in the church. Mr. Hamilton not suspecting the malice and treachery of his enemies, remained in St. Andrews. There, after a mock trial, they proceeded to pronounce sentence upon him, as an obstinate heretic. Being thus condemned, he was delivered over to the secular power;

and after dinner, on the same day, the fire was prepared and he was led to execution. Neither the love of life, though in youth, or fear of this cruel death, could in the least move him from the truth he had boldly confessed. At the place of execution he gave his servant, who had attended him, his gown, coat, and other garments, saying, "These are the last things you can receive from me, nor have I any thing more to leave you, but the example of my death, which I pray you to bear in mind; for though it be bitter to the flesh, and fearful before men, yet it is the entrance into eternal life." When at the stake, he said, "How long, O Lord, shall darkness overwhelm this realm? And how long wilt thou suffer the tyranny of these wicked men?" At length, with a loud voice, he cried, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," and fell asleep, in the 25th year of his age, March 4, 1527. His youth, his learning, his Scriptural doctrine, his pious and amiable manner, and then, his heroic Christian death, recommended him to all.

CORNER STONE.

The ceremony of laying the Corner Stone, of the Church now building by "*The Second Society of United Christian Friends*," in this city, took place on Thursday of last week, (the day first appointed being unfavourable.) The exercises were appropriate and interesting. Br. Mitchell officiated on this occasion, and delivered an Address, combining both the evidences and illustrations of the faith of Abraham, as well as answering, effectually, the objections of opposers of the truth, that "God is the Saviour of *all* men, especially of them that believe." A large number attended, and the utmost decorum prevailed to the end of the exercises. The following are copies of the Inscriptions contained in the Corner Stone; which inscriptions are safely deposited as a record for "generations to come."

"To the Most High, the only living and true God, our heavenly Father, for his worship, and the knowledge, edification and happiness of *all* men, his children, We, the Trustees of the '*Second Society of United Christian Friends in the city of New-York*,' dedicate and build this house; in full assurance of His countenance, assistance and protection; to whom we look, now, henceforth and for ever, for all things; to whom be the ascriptions of power, wisdom, and glory. *Amen*. In the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 1823. And the 48th year of the Independence of our beloved country. Names of Trustees, &c.

"The Congregation who build this house, inform posterity, that they are believers in the doctrine of the "*RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS*." Which doctrine was first promulgated in these United States of America, by our brother in the Lord John Murray, who landed on these shores from England, in the year of our Lord 1772. The First Society of this Faith in this city, now worship in the Brick Church in Duane-street, of which our Brother Edward Mitchell is Pastor, who assisted in laying this corner stone, July 10, 1823."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees."

Where is your precedent for the ceremoniously laying the corner stone of a Meeting-house, with an address, &c.? Why at one corner more than another, or one house more than another? Where is your precedent for meeting house dedications? What is the object? Where is your precedent for ordinations and installations? Where is your precedent for brother A.'s travelling two or three hundred miles to preach an ordination sermon; or brother B.'s going a day's journey to make a prayer; or brother C.'s giving the right hand of fellowship, or brother D.'s giving the charge? &c. &c. &c.

What use can these pageants be to an enlightened public, who profess to believe pomp and parade unnecessary to kindle the fire of devotion?

By giving the above a place in your paper, with, or without comment, you will oblige

A SUBSCRIBER.

ANSWER.

We will be candid, and inform our correspondent of what we believe was the motive in laying the corner stone, &c. ceremoniously. A report had obtained very extensive circulation, that the Church would not be erected. Those friendly to the building of this house, felt themselves authorized to give publicity to their intentions and acts, by any lawful means they could employ. They have obtained the desired end. The erroneous reports are contradicted, and many persons wishing well to this establishment are now rejoicing, who recently lamented the supposed relinquishment of, what they considered to be, a necessary and laudable undertaking.

The remaining interrogations of our correspondent we leave unanswered. They relate to transactions which we are not identified with.

WORKS OF DARKNESS.

A Methodist Sermon was recently put into our hands, from which we extract the following. "As we have violated the precepts of the moral law, in thought, word, and deed, we are condemned by it, and are exposed to its inconceivably awful penalty—even to death eternal." Again—"We are all in a state of guilt and condemnation, and in danger of everlasting misery. But Jesus has redeemed us from the curse of the law," &c. We ask, What is the value of that redemption, which leaves the redeemed in danger of everlasting misery? We answer, and say, Not one pin! It is good for nothing. No wonder the Methodists weep, and wail, and gnash their teeth, at their meetings, if this is their faith. Their saviour is a poor one indeed. Their redemption rotten at the core. And their condition, in danger of everlasting misery, is so terrible, that if they were to bawl and scream ten times as loud, if it were possible, it would well comport with their wretched state. Now we assure them, that a greater falsehood cannot be found, than this abominable doctrine. For the Scriptures nowhere declare that the penalty of the law is eternal (or endless) death. They do declare, of Christ, "in whom we have re-

demption, even the forgiveness of sins." Not danger of everlasting misery. How long ye simple ones will ye love simplicity, and scorners delight in scorning, and fools hate knowledge?

CHURCH AND STATE,

OR A NEW PULL AT AN OLD ROPE.

The Reverend Doctor Gardiner Spring has published a pamphlet, an appeal to the public; in which he has attempted to produce arguments and testimony to enforce the observance of the Sabbath. The Doctor, we presume, and his compeers, ever since the Park affair, have felt the decline of their greatness, and are now sensible, in earnest, that unless something can be found to trig the wheels of dignity, they will slip quite to the bottom of the hill of ecclesiastical preferment. We, all things considered, rather pity the Doctor and his associates. Alas! to be obliged so soon, like his pious prototype, cardinal Woolsey, to say, "Here's an end to all my greatness," is truly lamentable. We purpose to take respectful notice of Dr. Spring's work, which, these hard times, will confer a favour, and help the sale of it. We do this, too, partly from charitable motives. For the Dr. has only the income of about \$4,000 per annum! A man with so small a stipend cannot afford the loss of a penny. We hope the Dr. will realize enough by the profits on the sale of the book, to meet the dues to the Bible Society.

WARNING TO SABBATH BREAKERS.

On Sunday the 8th inst. Mr. William Wilson, of Vernon, (N. J.) went out in the morning to catch some fish, and while standing on the edge of the creek, engaged in fishing, his feet slipped, and he fell into the water. Before assistance could be procured, his spirit was before the bar of his God. He has left a wife and five children. *Goshen Patriot.*

WARNING TO FRIDAY BREAKERS.

From the Connecticut Mirror, July 11.

The Rev. Elisha B. Cook, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Manchester, (formerly Oxford) was drowned last Friday afternoon, in crossing a brook, while returning from a neighbour's, whom he had been assisting in gathering his hay. This must be one of the most afflicting strokes that could be laid on the Society: for he was beloved, and respected as a good pastor should be by the people of his charge. We have not yet heard more particulars of this very melancholy occurrence.

REMARKS.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Mr. Wilson was drowned on the first day of the week, and the Rev. Mr. Cook, on the sixth day. But neither of them on the Jewish Sabbath. The Christian's Sabbath is every day!

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRISTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1823.

NO. 11.

MR. BOSWELL'S ARTICLES.

Agreeably to promise we publish Mr. Boswell's Articles of his new faith. Our remarks are brief, and enclosed in brackets.

I. "I believe Jesus Christ is the one Jehovah, in divine humanity, in whom there is a sacred trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

[Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The humanity, the flesh and blood common to all men. See Heb. ii. 14. If there is any Trinity or plurality, it must be as extensive as the human race; for "God will be all in all."]

II. "That the Scriptures are divinely inspired, and written allegorically, having a natural and spiritual meaning."

[The Scriptures are a revelation of God's word and will. A *Testament*, in which a record is made of God's intentions towards his offspring, all men. They are from God, through the medium of his Son, his prophets, &c. They speak of natural and spiritual things. They illustrate spiritual things by natural figures.]

III. "That man, by sin, has fallen from the purity and order in which he was created, by the abuse of his free will, and thereby lost the moral image of God, that was originally impressed on his soul; and is by nature dead in trespasses and sins."

[The earthly man is and always was earthly. The use or abuse of his free will, or any will possessed by the earthly man, cannot change his nature. The Potter moulded the *clay* to suit himself; and has never experienced disappointment in one vessel that he has made. Did the Maker make man subject to vanity? When man became subject to vanity, was the Maker disappointed? Reason, not folly, ought to be the guide.]

IV. "That he is saved by grace, which is the divine love and mercy; through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; which is a faith that regenerates the heart, and is productive of charity and good works."

[Man, most assuredly, is saved by God's grace, or favour. Not, as is madly supposed, by believing the creeds of Calvin, Luther, Hopkins, Arminius, and the many bigots who have sat in judgment on the human race.]

V. "That the Lord is willing to save all who repent, and never ordained any man to hell; but that they who are lost perish by their own rejection of the Lord."

[Christ, so say the Scriptures, "is exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour." What! To save all who repent? Ans. "To give repentance unto Israel, and remission of sins." For "The Son of man is come to save that which was lost."]

VI. "I fully believe in the resurrection; that after death we shall arise in a spiritual body, which will be, in every respect, like that which we now have."

[In the resurrection, (see 1 Cor. xv.) we shall be *changed*. We shall have a body as different from the body we now have, as spirit is different from gross matter, and incorruption from corruption. It will be different in every respect.]

VII. "That after death man goes to a state suitable to his condition, and either enjoys eternal pleasure in the presence of God and holy angels, or eternal wretchedness with miserable spirits: as his life has been good or evil."

["Eternal wretchedness with miserable spirits," is not suitable to the condition of any creature who has any feeling or consciousness. The doctrine which teaches this wicked conclusion, is only suitable for devils.]

VIII. "That baptism and the Lord's supper are of the Lord's appointment; not essential nor spiritual, but representative of spiritual things; and that God may be worshipped acceptably with or without form. John i. 33. &c."

[The eighth article is a very harmless production. It is quite *neutral*.]

IX. "That there is in the soul of man the fire and light of God, though lodged in a state of hiddenness, till discovered by the providence and grace of God."

[This article is at open war with the seventh. Sending the fire and light of God to an endless hell, is impiously wicked and foolish.]

X. "I believe in what is termed free communion, and that true religion teaches us to extend the hand of charity to all good men, of whatever name they may be called."

["Charity," says the good book, "never faileth." Mr. B.'s charity is not of the true stamp. It is hatred.]

XI. "That carnal warfare is strictly forbidden, and altogether incompatible with the religion of Christ."

[We are of opinion, that the worst and most carnal warfare, is the consigning our neighbours to an *endless hell*! Mr. B. has shifted the shoe on the other foot. Mr. B., as is common with those who believe and teach the traditions of men, *altered* the Scriptures a little to favour his *charity*, we presume. Making Isa. lxvi. 24, read "the worm shall never die," for *not die*! This is a poor commencement. We wish him all success in the truth; and all confusion in error. Mr. B. in his book advises the people of his charge, to "seek an *internal* evidence of

their adoption;" and assures them that "they will always find a witness in *their favour*." There never was a Pharisee yet but could find a witness in a corrupt and wicked heart, which would testify in his *own favour*, and damn his neighbour for ever.]

REMARKS ON UNIVERSALIST.

(See last Number of the Gospel Herald, pp. 77, 78.)

We are much obliged to our correspondent, who styles himself a "Universalist," for saving us the trouble of furnishing a confutation of his sentiments. He asks, "Mr. Editor, where is your *good natural* man now, &c. ? Answer. We find him standing bolt upright in the first paragraph of your communication, as follows—"This *mortal body*, taken in the abstract, is as *sinless* a thing as a *tree*, or any inanimate substance. It may be merely the *instrument* of righteousness or unrighteousness, accordingly as it is actuated by an inward principle." You will please to recollect, that when this "*sinless mortal body* is actuated by an inward principle" which is *unnatural*, the man "is without natural affection," and is no longer good in his conduct, in any qualified sense whatever. We have *only* the testimony of God to support us, in addition to our correspondents assent, that when man was made, &c. God pronounced him *good*! Our correspondent will also please to recollect, that it is not the "*affections*" of the man we speak of, when we say the man by nature, that is, with the nature God made him, is good, but the man himself; the creature, as he came from the hand of the Creator. Our correspondent will be careful, we hope, and not accuse a good God of making an "old corrupt man." It is when the good man that God made becomes evil, that he is corrupt. How is man corrupt? Answer. In his *thoughts*, and in his *ways*. Just the same as *water*, a pure element, is corrupted by the assimilation of foreign ingredients, which corrupt the water by association, without changing one original quality of the pure element. See Rom. iii. "They are all gone out of the way." Now they must have been in the way, or they could not have gone out of it. "They are together become unprofitable." Once they were not unprofitable. "Their tongues have used deceit." Not their *tongues* are deceit. "The poison of asps is under their lips." Not their *lips* are poison. "Destruction and misery are in their *ways*." Not, destruction and misery are in *man*.

To the reader, whoever he may be, we say, Friend, how came you here? Was it by your own accord? Were you consulted, and have you a wicked nature, of your own selection and choice? If this is the case, and you were possessed of ability to choose and arrange the manner of your existence better than you have done, you are only reaping the reward of your own folly. But you know, this is not the case. You found yourself in this mode of being, and never solicited the life you possess. You were sent here, per force, on an errand, and fitted by the Being who sent you, to perform your errand or part, in a manner compatible with the *design* of sending you. Now hearken. God will never punish a *stone*, because it is not *water*; nor *fire*, because it is not

earth. Nor will the wise man cut down his *apple* trees because they do not bear *cherries*! What say you, Will God torment fishes for not grazing in the meadows; and make the bullock miserable, because he does not seek his food in the depths of the sea? This would be quite as wise, and just, and honourable, as to torment mankind because they are just such creatures as God made them. We have seen foolish man, punish his offspring and dependents, when in a petulant humour, for doing precisely as they were ordered. This conduct is wicked and disgraceful. Will God do thus?

Reader, in common with other appetites and desires, you have the appetite of *hunger*. If you eat to excess, and produce a fever by your gluttony, will God damn you for ever? If so, are you tormented for eating; "*at all*," or for eating *too much*? Let reason speak. Your fever, the consequence of your gluttony, will be your punishment. Man was made just right, and as he ought to be. His desires, every one of them, which God gave him, are good. But, God never implanted in the bosom of any man, the desire to make a fellow man miserable. This desire is going out of the way. Here is the root of the whole matter. Mankind are seeking what they foolishly suppose to be their *own* good, by making *others* miserable. A pure Calvinistic and Hopkinsian doctrine this. For, if God's glory can be advanced by making mankind, or any part of them, miserable, man's glory can be advanced by the same means. Strange infatuation. We find men, Divine Doctors too, who make a *devil* of their god, and then make *devils* of themselves. "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Matt. xvi. 23. This may seem a little harsh to some delicate minds; but there is abundance of truth in it.

God will be glorified in the *salvation* of sinners. True. But will he not also be glorified in the damnation of sinners? Yes, friend. Take a reason for it. Because the condemnation of sinners will pave the way for their salvation. As saith Paul, "God hath concluded them all in unbelief [a state of condemnation, or *damnation* if you like it better,] that he might have *mercy upon all*!" This is the way God will be glorified. Not by the endless howlings of miserable wretches in a hell of unmerciful cruelty, consigned to excruciating agonies, for possessing the desires and feelings which he gave them, and bestowed by an irresistible impulse, so that he might damn them for doing just as he decreed and compelled them to do!

Men may write volumes, and consume all the paper in creation, in attempts to illustrate and establish the systems of the devil. It is all to no purpose, except to support printers and paper makers, and to keep up the enormous salaries of pious drônes, who hang as a dead weight on society. The whole matter is settled in the revelation of God. Hear it. "What have I required of thee, O man; but that thou do *justly*, love *mercy*, and walk *humbly* with thy God!" Again. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." Man is gone out of the way. But it is

declared, "All the ends of the world shall *remember* and turn unto the Lord." Long prayers and hypocritical grimace are useless. All doctrines which exclude any part of the human race from God's love, are marked with the impress of the beast, and prove their origin to be from hell. *Religion* can never be separated from charity or love. Charity or love, if it claim affinity with heaven, must extend to all, and embrace the whole human family. The love of a *part*, is the love of the publican and sinner. The love of the *whole*, is the love of God; and will continue and expand, until every bosom shall be the receptacle of all that can render man happy, and God glorious.

REMARKS

ON TRIUMPH OF TRUTH, BY MR. ELWALL.

Mr. Elwall speaking of Christ, (see last Number, p. 76, col. 1.) says, "God has exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour to all those that *obey* the pure doctrine which God gave him to teach," &c. It is remarkable that a man of Mr. E.'s understanding should thus mistake the meaning and design of God's redemption. The Book declares, "He shall save his people from their *sins*." Those "that *obey* that pure doctrine," are saved already. "The whole need not a physician, but them that are *sick*." This is a common error. Christ, say they, will save *good* people. Save them from what? Their *goodness*? That would be a pity, surely. The greater the sinner, the more need of salvation.

Mr. E. adds—"Then shall we be saved, not by the *merits* of Christ; that is another popish invention," &c. Not by any means, when it is properly understood. The *merits* of Christ, include all his qualities, powers, and perfections. If we are saved by Christ, in any way or shape, we are, strictly speaking, saved by his merits. An impotent or cruel man, will look on, unmoved, and see his fellow perish. A strong and merciful man, will rescue his fellow from danger and suffering. In this case, *strength* and *humanity* are *merits*. Therefore every thing done by Christ to effect the salvation of man, was *meritorious*!

Extend the principle farther—The great Author of our being, and of all things, never did any thing incompatible with his being and perfections. A contrary course would be *unworthy* of a God! We are authorized to say this. For our heavenly Father has said, relative to his goodness towards man, "For mine own sake, will I do it; for how should *My name* be polluted." Will any one pretend that the *merits* of God are *not* merits, because He has conducted in all things, and in every respect, as His exalted character, being and perfections, demanded or required? We trust not. Reader, the Book informs us, (Heb. i. 3.) that Christ, the Son, was the "*brightness* of glory, and the *express image* of His [the Father's] *hypostases*," improperly rendered *person*. The Son, therefore, is the "*express image* of the identical *substance* of God. If there is merit in the *substance*, there must be merit in the *express image* of it. If this is not a correct and irresistible conclusion, words have no meaning. Well, then,

did Christ say, "He that hath seen *Me*, hath seen the *Father*," for the Son was His "*express image*!" As much so, as the natural sun, reflected from water, is seen.

From the (Hartford) Religious Inquirer.

Providence, (R. I.) June 28, 1823.

BIGOTRY.

Mr. Editor—A circumstance has lately transpired in this town, of such a nature, that it is requisite it should be made public. It being thought necessary that Br. Bisbe's Sermon, at the Installation of Br. Pickering, should be published, the undersigned called on Mr. Hugh H. Brown, Printer, to make a contract in consequence of having a balance of a note due him from a partner in the printing establishment, of more than sufficient to pay the amount of printing. A certain agreement was entered into, Mr. Brown, however, seeming to have some scruples about printing the sermon, the contract was not completed. The above transpired previous to the manuscript being received; which was Thursday the 26th inst. when I called on Mr. Brown with the manuscript. He observed, that he considered the Universalist doctrine, dangerous and demoralizing, and he presumed I knew his sentiments, (he being a member of the First Baptist Church in this town) but if the sermon did not contain any attack on particular denominations, he would print it. I told him the design of the writer appeared to be, to show that the doctrines of *endless misery, original sin, election and reprobation, and vicarious suffering*, were the dreams of men, and not Bible doctrine, and that those doctrines were errors of the church; after which he shewed me the paper he should print it on, and agreed to do the work well. I then observed to him, that I respected any man who would act upon principle and conscientiously; and when he had read the manuscript, he would be better able to decide what it was, and then left him with the manuscript; agreeing, I should have a proof sheet on Saturday morning. The next morning, being Friday, I received the following note:

"Sir, on examining the copy which you have left with me for publication, and on further consideration of the subject, I have come to the conclusion that I should do violence to my own feelings to publish the same; as I cannot be instrumental of bringing obloquy and reproach upon those solemn truths of the word of God which I esteem too sacred to be treated with disdain. The religion which I profess requires self-denial, and sometimes sacrifices. Had the sermon contained nothing more than a defence of your system—without attempting to disparage what I esteem to be important doctrines, I *might*, perhaps, have published it. As it is, I feel it my duty to return the copy.

Yours, &c.

H. H. BROWN."

Mr. B. would be understood that he has practised the virtue of *self-denial*—has made a *sacrifice*, in refusing to print the sermon. If any sacrifice has been made by him in this case, it surely can be no other than that of his "*reason*" upon the altar of superstitution.

He may be asked if he practises this *self-denial* in regard to what is *weekly* published in the Providence Gazette? or, as he is professedly orthodox, why does he not refuse to publish *Theatrical* advertisements when sent to his office? And what sacrifice has he made? None, certainly in point of interest—for he unquestionably considers it much against his *temporal* interest to publish such a discourse: and as to his *eternal* interest, he views himself to be one of the *elect*, and as such, cannot miss the prize. I hope no one will suppose that any blame is to be attached to the partner in this establishment, for he was perfectly willing (if not anxious) to print the discourse. What shall we say, then? Was our brother Brown confident he should have no money to receive for the work? And did he think the sermon would not be printed unless he printed it; thereby hoping to keep it from public view? And was he also afraid of injuring his business, and his standing in the church? And did he think of the author of the sermon as Tertullus thought of Paul? "For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." I leave this to the consideration of impartial minds, to judge of Mr. Brown's motives in this affair.

SAMUEL W. WHEELER.

CALVINISM vs. NEW JERUSALEMISM.

OR, JOHN BURTT, vs. WILLIAM BOSWELL.

A friend at Trenton (N. J.) sent us a pamphlet, written by John Burtt, a Calvinist, in reply to Mr. Boswell's pamphlet, &c. These gentlemen are disputing to no purpose, on the import of a passage which is an acknowledged interpolation, (1 John v. 7.) and of no more authority than a quotation from Robinson Crusoe. Mr. Burtt winds up his sagacious remarks, on a subject that is acknowledged to be incomprehensible, as follows—"You will recollect that we do not say, that the number *three* is the number *one*, or that *three essences* make *one essence*; but that *three persons*, or *three ineffable modes* of existence, make *one God*." To show the puerile absurdity of this man's logic, we will change the things spoken of. Here we have it—"You will recollect that we do not say, that the number *three* is the number *one*, [or any thing like it,] or that *three apples* make *one apple*; but that *three potatoes*, or *three pumpkins*, make *one watermelon*." The absurdity now glares abominably. The principle is weighed in a new balance, and the veil of Calvinistic prejudice and ignorance removed from the idol. It is more reasonable to suppose that "*three potatoes*, or *three pumpkins*, make *one watermelon*," than to suppose that "*three persons*, or *three ineffable modes* of existence, make *one God*." We ask, Is *God made*? Who made him? The Calvinist may talk of making gods; but we ask, of "the *one only living and true God*." Is he, or was he, *made* of *modes*, *persons*, &c.?

Mr. Burtt, in p. 5, says, "When we conceive of the Father, we indeed conceive of a *different* Hypostasis, person, mode of existence, from the Son, and

from the Holy Spirit," &c. But, strange to relate, this "*different*" something which is conceived, is *one* and the *same thing* with that which is so *dis-similar*! Now the *watermelon* is altogether different from the *pumpkins* and *potatoes*, when at the same time, the *pumpkins* and the *potatoes* are the *watermelon*!!! In early life our imagination was outstripped in the description and fancies we read in "The Arabian Nights' Entertainments." But there is nothing to be found in that work, stuffed as it is with "genii, talismans, and wonderful lamps," which can compare with Mr. Burtt's pious necromancy.

Mr. Burtt introduces the opinions of several writers who lived early in the Christian era. Now we shall make short work with this hypothesis. The God we worship is "*ONE ONLY*." We have his positive unequivocal declaration, that "*besides HIM there is NONE ELSE*." We believe that God himself is better acquainted with his own existence and being, than Mr. Burtt, or Mr. Burtt's ancient writers; or even the Rev. Doctor Hooper Cumming, M. A.! And farther, the God we worship, was never *made* of modes nor persons. We leave it to the reader to decide, how near men approximate to rationality, when they talk of having a god who is *indivisible*, and, at the same time, *made* of modes, persons, and consisting of *three parts*!!!

Mr. Burtt, as a Calvinist, believing the final destiny of both elect and non-elect, was irrevocably fixed before any of the human race were ushered into being, very consistently warns Mr. Boswell of the danger of his *elect* or non-elect soul, and wishes him to take care of it!

Mr. Burtt has something to say of the "vicarious sacrifice and imputed righteousness of Christ," &c. Mr. Burtt says, "Death is the penalty which the sinner *must* suffer, either in his *own person*, or in that of a *proper substitute*." Ah! Where did Mr. Burtt learn this? Mr. Devil, what is your doctrine, which the good pious folks of our day say, the wicked Universalists preach? Devil. Why, I preach, that "*ye shall not surely die*." How is this? Shall not sinners *surely die*? Ans. Mr. Burtt. "*Jesus suffered in the stead of sinners*." Well, the Devil on the whole, was right. It is certainly slander to accuse the Devil of *lying*, if Mr. Burtt tells the truth. They both preach the same doctrine, and will stand or fall together. Now we say, the Devil was a *liar*! "The soul that sinneth it *shall die*." Reader, take Paul, that honest old man of old times, who never was disgraced by being called *Doctor of Divinity*, and the *Reverend* Mr. Paul; and who neither was a pander for himself nor others, to obtain the "goats milk," and live in the smiles and purses of the people. Paul, what sayest thou? What is thy opinion of this matter? Do all sinners die, or not? You was a sinner Paul, and being an honest man, you were willing to own it. How did it fare with you, when you sinned? Ans. Paul. "*I died*." Rom. vii. 9. We hazard the declaration, that Paul will lay on Mr. Burtt's hands. Pray, friend Burtt, how happened it, that so good a man as you will acknowledge Paul was, could receive no benefit

from the "vicarious sacrifice" of Christ, who "died in the stead of sinners," but was obliged to die for his own sins?

In p. 15, Mr. Burt says, "All these properties of a fit substitute meet in Jesus: as God he is independent, not naturally subject to the law, but the fountain of it; therefore he is at his own disposal, and capable of becoming a willing substitute, and performing a meritorious obedience in the stead of others; as man he possesses the same nature which transgressed the law, and is therefore capable of becoming a proper sacrifice for sin; it being inequitable that *any other nature* should suffer than that which had disobeyed."

Now we have Mr. Burt's word for this. We suppose Mr. Burt would prove that Christ was "not naturally *subject to the law*," by the following passages, Gal. iv. 4. where it is declared of Christ that he was "made under the law." Matt. iii. 15. "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." There is a very novel idea contained in Mr. B.'s declaration. Christ made the law. The law maker is independent; he can observe the law, or *violate* it, just as he pleases. Calvinism "is all of a piece!"

In p. 16, Mr. Burt says, "See, among other passages, which might be referred to, Rom. v. 6—8, recollecting if you are acquainted with the original, that the word *hyper*, rendered *for*, when used in such a connexion, signifies, *in the stead of*. The English word, *for*, has the same meaning. When a man dies for another, he dies *in the stead of* another. 'When we were yet without strength, in due time, *Christ died in the stead of the ungodly*.'"

This solution of Mr. Burt's smells strong of Princeton college. We conjecture that Mr. Burt, to use a homely phrase, was "smokeing his antagonist." Is Mr. Boswell ignorant of the original? Will he swallow these Calvinistic dogmas, forsooth, because they are sugared over with a *half-compliment*? Now, although the Reverend Doctor Hooper Cumming will have his nearsighted admirers believe, that we Universalists are "*utterly ignorant*," &c. we shall venture to teach this gentleman of Princeton a little. Reader, the public shall be umpire in this case. Therefore, judge ye, of the following testimony. Mr. Burt says, "the word *utroque*, rendered *for*, when used in such a connexion, signifies *in the stead of*." So be it. Look at this. 1 Cor. xv. 3. "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I received, how that Christ died *for* our sins according to the Scriptures," &c. Take Mr. Burt's rule and apply it. Christ died "*in the stead of our sins*." It was our *sins* which ought to have died, and Christ died "*in the stead of our sins*!" Examine the connexion of the passage in Rom. v. 8. The seventh verse follows—"For scarcely *for* a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die." The apostles died *for* the cause of Christ; for the cause of God. Did they die *in the stead of* that cause? The word means *on account of*, not *in the stead of*. Quere. What does Rom. iv. 25, mean? "Who was delivered *for* our offences, and was raised again *for* our justification." Will any man pretend, that

Christ was justified *in the stead of* man, and that man, in consequence, will never be justified? Error will not do.

In p. 16, Mr. Burt also declares, that "The Calvinists do not hold, as their opposers sometimes slanderously say, and as your language might insinuate, that the Lord arbitrarily *ordains* some to hell, without regard to their *good or evil*. On the contrary, we maintain, that 'God is judge of the whole earth,' and that, as such, he condemns and punishes the obstinate sinner; and *that there is not a being in hell, that is not there by his own fault*.'"

Now we declare that they do hold to this very sentiment, and we give their *own words* to prove it. We well know they are *ashamed* of their abominable principles, and will, as in the present case, be wilfully guilty of rank *falsehood*, to escape the indignation of the honest and honourable part of the community! This is, in very deed, "using great plainness of speech." But these men *deserve* it, and they *shall have it*!

¶ "For all are not *created* to like estate: but to some eternal life, and to some *eternal damnation* was *fore-appointed*. Therefore, as every man is *created* to the one or the other end, so we say that he is *predestinated* either to life or death." (*Cal. In. B. 3. ch. 21. sec. 5.*) Now for the merit or demerit, of the parties: "This counsel as touching the *elect*, we say is grounded on his free mercy *without any respect* to the *worthiness* of the man; but whom he appointeth to *damnation*, to them, by his just indeed, and irreprehensible, but also incomprehensible judgment, the entry of life is *blocked up*." (*B. 3. ch. 22. sec. 7. and ch. 23. sec. 3.*) "The decrees were *not formed* in consequence of any *foresight of sin or holiness*, in the reprobate or elect." (*B. 3. ch. 22. sec. 11. and B. 3. ch. 24. sec. 11, 12, 13, 14.*)

Let no Calvinist, in future, have the wickedness, the impudence, and the hardihood, to come forward and deny the above quotations. If they do, we shall hold them up to full view, and expose them and their abominable principles together!

The very learned and *consistent* Mr. Burt, as is common with those of his doctrine, has very comfortably tumbled into a pit of his own digging. In p. 17., speaking of the resurrection, he says, "A spirit is a simple substance, *incapable of division*." Pray, Sir, how is it that you *divide* your god, or *spirit* whom you worship, and make *three persons* of him? We advise Mr. Burt to apply all his reasoning and arguments, which he so manfully used against Mr. Boswell's resurrection, to his doctrine of the *Trinity*!

In p. 19. Mr. Burt declares of the soul, that "it is *not mortal*." We recommend to him to go to the original once more, and learn the definition of the word rendered *immortality*. If the soul is *not mortal*, it is *immortal*, and if immortal, it *cannot die*. Pray, Sir, how will you kill your *immortal sinners*? They will live in spite of you! Mr. Burt has one expression which no Calvinist can subscribe to, and retain his rank Calvinism. He says, speaking of God, (p. 19.) that he "is able by his power, and bound by his *faithfulness*, to raise man's body from

the dust." When the body is raised, recollect, it will be an "*incorruptible*, and *immortal*" body. A body that will bid defiance to John Calvin, and all his *Hells*, decrees of reprobation and damnation.

In p. 20, we read as follows—"You say that man goes to heaven or hell 'as his life has been good or evil.' Then, I am afraid that heaven must be left without inhabitant, as far as man is concerned in its population. For it is a scripture doctrine, that 'there is none righteous, no, *not one* : there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not ;' and if heaven be open only for the good, then, alas ! for man. 'There is none good but God.' " Mr. Burr here places all men on a level. Now let him talk of "slandering Calvinists." Pray, Sir, look at your decrees, consigning men to *hell* on the one hand, and heaven on the other, according to their *deserts*, and blush for your folly and absurdity.

Conclusion. If there is any thing pre-eminently foolish and vile, and without excuse, it is the denying one's sentiments and principles. Conduct of this description justly entitles the timeserving deceiver to the appellation of *hypocrite*. It may be termed every thing that is dishonourably unjust, and criminally dishonest, which has any association or affinity with the belief or opinions of the party ; and is an insuperable bar to every *good* principle which can ascribe glory to God, or sincerely express a desire for the welfare and happiness of man. Every arm should be raised to resist the progress—every voice should be lifted to denounce the promulgation—and every heart should be steeled against the reception, of such abominable practices, principles, manners, and systems. The altar of absurdity is already deluged with the blood of victims, whose insanity told the tale of their miseries, and now cries for vengeance !

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—I was at the meeting-house of Mr. Van Velsan, Sunday afternoon, July 13, and for once witnessed the truth, that there is a system of doctrine which first sprung from Hell. For Mr. Van V. to disprove the doctrine of the salvation of all men, said, he "would prove that his god did not believe the doctrine, nor the Devil, nor the damned in Hell did not believe it." He then said he would "prove it by all the *infernal motley brood*." We read, "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. He that believeth not shall be damned." Now, as Mr. Van V. does not believe, we think his word would do as well as his motley brood.

He likewise warned his people against conversing with Universalists ; for, said he, they are going about proselyting among the children of God. He also said, that "many a tender-conscienced child of God, meeting with them, are led away, and when they had gained them they were made two-fold more the child of Hell than they are themselves." Mr. Van V. does not believe in falling from grace. He declared, that "Universalists dragged the damned

out of Hell with all their dirty clothes on." Now, if his dear children of his God, by believing in a God of love, are made two-fold more the children of Hell than Universalists are themselves, they must have on some of their old Calvinistic clothes.

JOHN C. HENRY.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine. ✂ ANOTHER CONVERSION IN THE MINISTRY.

Plymouth, (Mass.) June 30, 1823.

REV. HOSEA BALLOU,

Sir—Though unacquainted with you, I take the liberty to address you on the subject of religion, hoping you will not take it amiss, as I have lately come out in defence of Universal Salvation.

In my 19th year, (about 8 years ago,) I united myself to the Methodist Episcopal Church ; and for seven years I have been an official member, and for about four years a preacher, in said church : and though I can bear testimony to the pious sincerity of my brethren in the ministry, and my lay brethren in general, such is the imperfection of our discipline, that no difference of opinion can be tolerated, especially among the ministry ; and on that account I find myself under the disagreeable necessity of withdrawing my membership, and uniting with some society of more liberal and tolerant views.

I believe the following are the principal points in which I differ from my brethren. 1. I do not like Episcopacy. 2. I do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity. 3. I do not believe in total depravity, or any other depravity, that makes it necessary for us to hate God, previous to a supernatural conversion. 4. I do not believe in infinite, nor vicarious atonement. 5. I do not believe in supernatural conversion. 6. I do not believe there is a wicked immaterial being possessing personal identity, whom the Lord permits to wander about, and constantly counteract his gracious designs ; nor do I believe in any other devil, but wicked men, and personified principles of evil. 7th, and lastly, I do not believe in the unmerciful doctrine of endless punishment. The above named points, I consider neither scriptural nor reasonable. My articles of faith are very simple, I believe in one God and one Lord Jesus Christ, and that because he lives we shall live also. I have never read any universalist books, except, lately, a sermon, and I have never heard any universalist preaching, except two sermons at the dedication of the new Meeting-House in Boston, a few weeks ago. If you will have the goodness to answer this, this week, and let me know wherein I differ from you, and on what condition, I can be received as a preacher into the Universalist Church, you will oblige me very much.

ELIPHALET CASE, JUN.

From the New-England Advocate. RELIGION EXEMPLIFIED.

The fact is well known through the state, that a small Methodist society in Norwich, by an overwhelming flood, lost their Meeting-house, which had been erected by the greatest exertions. It is

also as well known, that the subject came before the last General Assembly, when a contribution was authorized to be taken up, to relieve their spiritual distresses.

There are many of our fellow-citizens who may have contracted wrong impressions relative to administering to the wants, and relieving the miseries of our fellow-men. If there is any fault in us, it is that intolerant spirit, which leads us to believe that all persons who do not belong to any particular sect, are not entitled to our commiseration. If congregationalists, we are too apt to despise the Methodists and deride the Baptists. If Episcopalians, the hand of charity is too apt to be closed against the poor of other denominations.

The religion which Christ taught, and his disciples followed, knows but one God, and one Saviour, through whose blood all must be saved, or they finally perish.

In the state of Connecticut we recognize in the Methodist society, a set of *devout and humble* worshippers, whose religious rights and freedom were equally secured from oppression, by the constitution of our state. When that instrument was adopted, it was fondly anticipated that those invidious distinctions would be lost with the excesses of the day, and give place to the better feelings of the heart, which remind us that we are all of one common family, and are destined to one common judgment.

It is painful to believe that there is one clergyman on earth, who desires to behold the substance of his people taken from them and sent to some foreign clime, while his own brethren are languishing for the bread of life. It is humiliating to believe that any people can be so lost to a just sense of that charity, which "hopeth all things and endureth all things," as to justify any man in reproaching his fellow-Christians, when clothed himself in the habiliments of a teacher of the mild precepts of the gospel of our Lord and Saviour.

Last Sabbath day, the Rev. Pastor of a society in Canterbury, read the proclamation of the governor, authorizing the contributions to enable the poor Methodist brethren to rebuild the temple of their God, whom they delight to honour: and immediately after, addressed the following remarks to his congregation; viz. "Let it please or displease whom it may, I shall observe that this same benevolent legislature, who granted the petition of this Methodist society, for the purpose of building a Meeting-house, rejected the petition of the Missionary Society in this state, for the purpose of sending the Gospel where they have not any Meeting-house nor preachers—for myself, I shall not give any thing!"

Having finished this singular address, the Rev. Pastor sat down with such apparent ill-humour towards the cause, that those who had ever so much disposition to comply with the benevolent intentions of the General Assembly, dared not do it in his presence.

The Deacon then rose and seconded the views of His Reverendship, and added, "that he should give

nothing, and he presumed that no one else would." The Parson, however, upon further consideration, permitted the Deacon to hold his *hat at the door*, in which was found some time afterward, the sum of **THIRTY-ONE CENTS!!** It is presumed that this was not put in until after the donors got out of the house. Comment to a Christian community, is wholly needless.

"He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed,
For he giveth his bread to the poor." *Solomon.*

SALVATION CONSIDERED.

A correspondent has requested us "to explain in the course of the present volume, the different meanings of the word *saved*." He introduces Jer. viii. 20; Matt. xxiv. 13; and Acts xxvii. 31, as passages which he considers have been absurdly applied by Arminians, &c. The first, Jer. viii. 20, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved," unquestionably has an exclusive application to the judgments of God upon the people Israel, at the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, and the winding up of the Mosaic economy. Christ quoted from the prophets, in his parables; and his parables generally, having relation to the events prophesied, are, in a qualified sense, the prophecies in a new dress. The prophecies and the parables related to the Jewish nation, except in the instances where the Gentiles are distinctly spoken of and included. In the connexion [Jer. ix. 11.] it is declared, "I will make Jerusalem heaps, a den of dragons; and will make the cities of Judea desolate." The reader will please to turn to the parable and exposition, in Matt. xiii. 24-30; 36-43. This parable relates to the same event spoken of by the prophet. Christ says, "The harvest is the end of the world," *αἰῶνος*. The same world Paul speaks of in Heb. ix. 26. and should be rendered *age*. The salvation emphatically means the deliverance the Jews expected from the Messiah whom they looked for to come, when they rejected the true Messiah.

The next passage reads as follows—Matt. xxiv. 13. "But he that shall endure unto the *end*, the same shall be saved." What *end*? Ans. Paul says, of Christ, that he "appeared in the *end* of the world [the *age*]" to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." This relates to the same time and event spoken of in Jeremiah, and Matt. xiii. It would now be superfluous to prove that the destruction of Jerusalem is spoken of, and the *salvation*, an escape from the miseries there endured.

The passage from Acts xxvii. 31, "Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved;" is explained in the connexion. It was "the *ship men*;" the *sailors*, if you please, who were about leaving. Had they left the ship, none would have remained to manage her, the residue being unacquainted, and they would have been drowned as a matter of course. To say that the salvation of the *souls* of the passengers depended on the exertion of the *sailors*, would be absurd.

From the (Canandaigua) Plain Truth.

CORRUPTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.

"I have just read," says John Wesley, in one of his Journals, "Mr. Baxter's history of the Councils; it is utterly astonishing, and would be altogether incredible, were not his vouchers beyond all exception. What a company of execrable wretches have they been! For one cannot give them a better name, who have, in every age since that of St. Cyprian, taken upon them to govern the Church. How has one Council been perpetually cursing another, and delivering all to Satan, whether predecessors or cotemporaries, who did not implicitly receive their determinations, though generally trifling, sometimes false, frequently unintelligible, and self-contradictory! Surely Mahometanism was let loose to reform the Christians, and I know not but Constantinople has gained by the change."

Such were the sentiments of the pious and learned Wesley, the founder of Methodism. This eminent servant of God has been in his grave about 32 years. While he lived, his orthodox enemies lavished on him every opprobrious epithet of abuse then known. In order to render him unpopular and even horrible to the English vulgar, they called him a *Jesuit*! Had he lived in our own times, the American orthodox would have dubbed him an infidel! They would not have called him a *Jesuit*, for the orthodox vulgar do not understand the term. The infidel is *mouthing* even to loathing by our male and female devotees. It is used as often and as loosely as the term *rebel* was by "his majesty's officers" during the war of 1775. Perhaps the parallel will not end here. The advocates of liberal Christianity are fast increasing, and could easily turn the tables, and cry infidel in their turn. The result of the revolution showed who were the real rebels and traitors, and the result of the present religious controversy will unmask the real infidels. North called our fathers rebels—Pitt praised their patriotism. North's memory is execrated, while that of Pitt is revered.

"One is your Master, Christ."

We are sometimes told that we are too hard, in our remarks, on the holy men of the day. The *Reverend Doctors*. The fact is, these reverend gentlemen are so amalgamated with their errors, and the affinity of the parson is so great with his opinions and practices, in the opinion of our censors, that no distinction can be kept up, but the parson, his follies and extravagances, make one man. Now we view things differently. For instance, take the *Reverend Doctor Spring*. We make a *duality*. The *Reverend Doctor* is the gentleman we deal with. Brother Gardiner Spring is entitled to our warmest sympathies. We wish him all the *real* enjoyments and pleasures of the passing scene; and we *rejoice*, that another and a brighter day will dawn upon his benighted mind, and usher him into a state of pure, unbounded, and glorious philanthropy and benevolence. Br. Hooper Cumming, and all our brethren, whether *Reverend Doctors* or *Reverends*, or plain laymen, however they may now differ from

us in sentiment, are included in our good wishes and sympathy. But—the *Reverend Doctors*, when they mount the wild horse of their fancied dignity, and ride over their fellows, need, and shall have, a wholesome trimming.

Died, in Cumberland, (R. I.) on the morning of 23d June, Br. Asa Wheaton. It is not a year since he received from the General Convention of Universalists, a Letter of Fellowship as a preacher of the gospel "of great joy, which shall be to all people; but it has pleased the Lord of the harvest to call his labourer to rest in the morning of his day. Let not our hearts repine. *Chris. Intell.*

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD. LINES

Occasioned by the laying of the Corner Stone of the New Church, now building for the use of the "Second Society of United Christian Friends, in the city of N. York."

O may a comely edifice arise
Upon this hallowed consecrated ground;
May incense here be wafted to the skies,
Here may the votaries of the Truth be found;
Here may the champions of the Cross appear,
Here may the gospel's standard be unfurl'd,
And while it waves, this motto may it bear,
"Salvation to a lost rebellious world."

Never may hydra-headed Error here,
Poison the air with his pestiferous breath,
And fill the mind with a terrific fear,
Scattering around his firebrands, arrows, death:
May Truth, refulgent as the sun at noon,
And showers of Wisdom from the heavens above,
The grateful heart in notes sincere attune
To praise our God, whose gracious name is Love.

May unity, and peace, and love divine,
Pervade the children who shall worship here,
And may this branch of Zion's fruitful vine,
Adore our God with holy filial fear:
Built on a rock—let angry foes assail,
Let Satan's slavish vassals rage and foam;
The gates of hell can never here prevail,
Jesus our Saviour is the Corner Stone.

E.S.G.

FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Ballou's Notes on the Parables.—Ballou on Atonement.—Ballou's Eleven Sermons.—Discourse delivered at the Installation of David Pickering, by J. Bisbe, Jun.—Discourse by D. Pickering, on the Doctrine of St. Paul.

AGENTS FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD:

Capt. J. C. Churchill, Portland, (Me.) Theodosius Parsons, Esq. Holmes Hole, (Mass.) Messrs. Noah S. Bailey, Norwalk, (Con.) Richard H. Woods, White Plains; Ralph Malbone, Brooklyn; Benjamin Wright, Jamaica; Ashbel Stoddard, Hudson; William R. Gregory, Ithaca, Stephen Van Schaack, Albany, (N. Y.) Henry Whyte, Petersburg, (Vir.) Timothy Bigelow, Palmyra, Portage Co. David Loring, Cincinnati; Horace Burroughs, Boardman, Trumbull Co. (Ohio.) Gershom D. Miller, Rahway; Williams Woolley, Morristown, (New-Jersey.)

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1823.

NO. 12.

FROM THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

A Discourse on Demonology, or Doctrines of Devils,
by J. S. THOMPSON. 1 Tim. 4. 1.

How deplorable is the state of the human mind, degraded by superstition! Fear being the mother of superstition, we may reasonably expect her gods to be hideous and terrific. Hence an imaginary Devil has obtained the greatest veneration in many countries of Asia and Africa. And even at this time, however incredible, his worship is very prevalent throughout all christendom. Being the popular god of modern superstition, if any independent man, who dares to think, expresses a doubt of his existence, the alarm is sounded, and fearing that the empire of the god of this world is about to be upset, all who wander after the *beast*, hasten to cry out for whole hours, Great is the Devil whom we adore! Be not surprised, the existence and influence of the Devil are as necessary to the creeds of modern times, as the honours of Diana to the craftsmen of Ephesus! Among the various objects of blinded nations' fear, the ghosts of departed heroes were admitted at a very early period. It was imagined by weak and perverted minds, that men who had distinguished themselves, in this world, by either good or evil actions, would retain their dispositions in the next; and be actively engaged in promoting the welfare of mankind, or plotting their ruin, as far as those propensities excited, or their influence extended. Therefore, men became naturally inclined to honour the good spirits for their services, and offer sacrifices to the evil, to placate their malevolence! Hence Plato and many other eminent philosophers taught that all intercourse between the Deity and mankind was carried on by means of demons, who ought on that account to receive divine homage. This doctrine was received by many of the heathen nations, and even by many of the Jews, especially the Essens, who believed that thousands of these demons officiated as mediators with Jehovah, and therefore ought to be worshipped. It was also a general opinion, that acute diseases, plagues, apoplexies, epilepsies, &c. were operated by demons, or ghosts of wicked men, who entered the human bodies and destroyed those who were not powerfully supported by the good demons. Accordingly we find, that in all the passages of scripture, which speak of persons possessed of devils, the original word is *quimon* and not *diabolos*, which should not therefore have been translated devil, nor devils. But it appears to have been an early and much agitated question among the philosophers, whence sprang that moral and physical evil which so often weakens the enjoyment and happiness of mankind. Being unwilling

to abase human pride, by charging it on man, or to attribute malevolence to the Deity, they imagined the existence of a wicked spirit to be absolutely necessary to the existence and continuance of disorder and pain in the world. But the quantum of evil being so great, they supposed that the evil spirit must nearly equal the Deity himself in wisdom and power. This doctrine of devilism was derived from the Persian theology, which taught the co-existence and nearly co-equality of two first causes; the one the author of all good, the other the source of all evil. This absurd opinion was the invention of their Magi, who were unable to account for the origin of all evil, on any other principles. Very different from this wild fancy, was the message of Jehovah to Cyrus, by the prophet Isaiah, which reproves the foolish sentiment, and declares Jehovah to be the author of light and darkness, and the creator of good and evil. Indeed it is altogether impossible that good and evil could exist otherwise; for that God who fills the immensity of space, must enclose in his very nature beings to whom he gave existence, and by whose fatherly care they are preserved. Hence it follows that the notion of the existence and influence of the devil is altogether inconsistent with correct and scriptural views of the divine nature and character. If a devil exist, he must be the rival, or servant of the Almighty. The first supposition is atheistic; for if there be a God, he is without a rival; nor would he suffer his designs to be frustrated, nor employ a servant to violate his laws, or disturb the peace of his empire. But says the objector, if there be no devil, then there is no God, no hell, no need of preaching! I would not have noticed such manifest puerilities, were they not proclaimed by the doctors of divinity and theological professors of the day, who sound the watch word of heresy, and lead the van of persecution. Is there no proof of God's existence but that the devil needs an opposer? O fie! Must God exist and we preach for the devil's sake? Shame on those men who sacrifice truth and insult good sense, to fan the fire of fanaticism! Is the devil the maker and governor of the infernal regions? Then certainly he will take good care not to torment himself nor his friends! The wicked have nothing to fear, for if any suffer, they must be the pious servants of God, who have rebelled against his satanic majesty! Moreover, if the devil be the director of hell, and fallen angels the inflictors of its punishments, can these unfortunate sufferers be the tormentors of men who have been equally so as themselves? Then surely the devil and his angels are God's servants, and must receive the reward of their services. But

are God's servants unhappy, and will virtue and misery be long connected? If not, then it follows that devils will be saints, and hell a field of liberty! The term Satan indicates no more than that propensity to evil so frequently observable in human conduct, and which like the chemical doctrines of phlogiston and caloric, is of great utility for the explanation of difficulties. All classical readers know that the most beautiful writings abound with bold, figurative, and hyperbolic descriptions. That nothing is more ornamental in poetry than prosopoeia, or the representation of good and evil qualities, virtues and vices, by personal characters. The word Satan signifies an adversary, and sometimes only an abstract quality, i. e. calumny. Accordingly, our translators have rendered the word throughout the bible. Though the term Satan occur frequently in the Scriptures, yet generally some human being is intended. David is so called, 1 Sam. xxix. 4. Hadad is denominated Solomon's devil or satan, 1 Kings, xi. 14. David describes those who rendered him evil for good as his satans; and prays that his satans might be clothed with shame. Ps. cix. 20. 29. Jesus calls Peter, satan, and Judas, a devil. Matt. xvi. 23. John vi. 70. In the New Testament, treacherous men, slanderous women, and opponents of every kind, are called satans or devils; and these words signify no more than adverse propensities. Indeed it would be an impious reflection on the character of the Deity, to suppose he had formed and let loose myriads of malevolent spirits to destroy the happiness of mankind. If it be demanded, whence arise those inducements to evil which so often disturb the peace of society, and ruin man's happiness? the answer is both easy and scriptural. The heart is deceitful, and every man is tempted when he is drawn aside, or enticed by animal passions or bodily appetites. These expose us to innumerable trials and temptations. Intemperance, avarice, ambition, envy, and discontentment beset us in their turns, and without the utmost vigilance and circumspection, we are in danger of being overcome. Now can the just and merciful God, the father of mankind, and moral governor of the world, think these propensities to evil so insufficient for the trial of our virtues, that he must superadd the agency of an evil being so subtle, so malicious, and so powerful as the Devil. What a desperate chance have we of succeeding against such an adversary! Shall we say, good is the will of the Lord; and that in all this he has done all things in wisdom! Banished for ever be the thoughts from all rational and serious persons. God could no more act thus than cease to exist. Every principle of his nature holds such conduct in eternal abhorrence.

Let the believers in a devil, consider,

1. That the belief of his existence constitutes no fundamental article of the christian faith; no part of the New Testament states the necessity of believing such an unreasonable doctrine. If particular passages seem to imply it, or cannot be clearly explained or understood, yet no inference should be drawn from a few passages that would contradict the decisions of reason and the general tenour of scripture.

2. It was perfectly consistent with the mission of Jesus to adopt the language of the country on all subjects which did not constitute the main objects of that mission. Christ came not to teach men philosophy, neither to spend his time in combating the Jewish demonology.

3. No passage can be adduced to support the doctrine of a devil, which does not contradict some part of the received opinions on that dogma—but every text in all the Scriptures which speaks of the devil or satan, can be fairly interpreted or explained, consistent with the whole tenour of scripture, on the supposition that there is no such being, but that these words universally mean an adversary or something adverse.

We might have expected that the most pertinacious believers in a devil, would have rejoiced to find, that reason, scripture, and common sense, are equally opposed to the terrifying dogma. But, alas! such are the religious infatuation and credulity of mankind, that an opinion once admitted is seldom rejected, however palpably absurd or monstrous—ridiculous. Hence we find christians cling as close to this doctrine, as if their present and future happiness depended entirely on the existence and influence of an infernal fiend! Atheism and the disbelief of a devil vibrate the same feelings of horror in the superstitious mind; and, perhaps, atheism itself is deemed by some to be less impious.

But if a devil there be, possessed of those powers and attributes generally ascribed to him, atheism becomes acceptable, and loses all its hideous forms, for the existence of such a being proves the non-existence of God, or that he is deficient in wisdom, goodness, and power.

Why then should men be alarmed, when this doctrine is attacked or disputed—and why should the war-whoop of party be sounded, when we attempt to disprove and explode this injurious and unreasonable opinion?

Has the devil created the universe, and filled it with inhabitants? Is he the author of all good, on whom our present and future happiness depends? Did all being start into existence at his command, is it supported by his power? Is his dominion unbounded and perpetual, and shall his authoritative voice awake the myriads of the dead, and determine their doom, appoint heaven as a reward for his enemies, and people the tartarian gulf with his allies and friends?

What impious absurdity! Jehovah alone holds the reins of universal empire, and all that can excite our hopes in this world, or perfect our felicity in the next, is unconnected with a satanic being.

If the doctrine that teaches the existence and influence of a devil, involve serious consequences, if it be anti-scriptural and unphilosophical, if it be fatal to man's moral improvement, if it poison the stream of religious knowledge at the fountain head, by supposing that God has a powerful antagonist, whose designs he has been unable to frustrate, and whose rebellion shall be as durable as the divine existence; in short, if correct notions of the divine character and government be inconsistent with the

belief in such a being, for the honour of God and religion, let the infamous doctrine be for ever rejected.

Those who believe in the existence of a devil, suppose that the evil which prevails in this world, results from his infernal agency; and also expect that the evil will be still greater in another and future state of being. There they look for a hell, crowded with inhabitants, through the resistless powers of diabolical influence: and this reign of misery, this triumph of the devil, they expect to be so complete and signal as to undergo no change through the revolution of eternal ages!!

How can persons who expect such a catastrophe of human affairs, have correct notions of that God, who is all benevolence; whose plans are conceived in wisdom, and executed in mercy; whose power cannot be resisted, and whose very name and nature are Love? Those who think God has a competitor, must deny the absolute will of the Deity, and his general providence. They derogate from his glory. They dishonour him, and perplex themselves with wild and embarrassing conclusions. In a word, they conjure up a devil to their own confusion, to the injury of christian truth, and the serious mischief of morality. The fear of a devil may perhaps keep some men of weak minds from excessive vice, and make them slavishly religious, and hypocritically moral. But the love of God alone, proceeding from a grateful recollection of his goodness and providential care, can produce genuine piety and virtue.

It is somewhat outrageous to suppose, that the Devil will punish wicked men who sinned by his instigation, and performed all their wicked deeds, in obedience to his desires. Can the punishment of sinners be inflicted by that being whom they never offended; and God, whose laws have been violated, have no concern in their sufferings? The belief in the existence of a devil is equally injurious to virtue, simplicity, and christian truth. It affords a palliative for crimes, and induces men to believe that wicked thoughts and evil actions have not been fomented in their own hearts, but spring from the suggestions of the wicked one. Sometimes men are hurried into enormities, conceiving themselves particularly tempted, at which their mild natures would shudder, were they not influenced by this deceitful doctrine.

If the belief in a devil did not obtain, men must either trace their sins to God as the author, or admit they originate with themselves; and as they could not presume to charge God directly with sin, they would, of necessity, acknowledge their own accountability; and repentance producing reformation, might justly be expected to result from such a happy conviction. Another serious evil arising from a belief in the existence of a devil, is the continual alarm and terror that reigns in the weak mind, tinctured with superstition, by the apprehension of satanic machination and artifice. Every inclination to enjoyment, every expostulation on religious faith, and even every suggestion of truth, though in the very words of scripture, if it seems to contradict long received opinions, are all attributed to the seduction

of Satan; and thus the perpetual dread of an imaginary being, keeps the mind in darkness, and the heart in agitation. Wild enthusiasm, gloomy superstition, and a long train of delusive thoughts, successively distract the serious mind which is unfortunately beclouded by a belief in the devil. And what is worse, men suppose him to be so refined in subtlety, and so irresistible in power, that vigilance is almost useless, and the strongest heart cannot feel subjection to his will without horror and dismay—hence a belief in the existence of the devil, has driven many weak persons to despair, which most assuredly is the natural consequence of such a wild doctrine.

What idea must those men have of God, who believe that he has placed his feeble creatures in a situation so hopeless and cruel? Must they not conclude that God created man for the purpose of making him miserable? And can the Creator be an object of love, veneration, and gratitude, whilst he is viewed in connexion with a malignant devil? If the account we have given of the Devil be just, then all notions of witchcraft, or of being possessed of the devil, are vain and groundless. 'Tis all deceit and imposition, and weakness and credulity of mankind. For shame! Let us entertain more honourable sentiments of the moral government of God. Let us think ourselves safe under the protection of his providence; safe from the malice both of devils and wicked men. Let us learn not to disturb ourselves with any vain or superstitious fears of evil spirits, for we are not subject to any malicious powerful beings. The Lord God Omnipotent reigns alone, whose tender mercies are over all his works. This consideration should fill us with ease and tranquillity, otherwise we do not give God the honour due to him; we do not repose that confidence in his providence which his wisdom and goodness require, and the security of our own happiness demands. O how different from the doctrines of devils, are the views of God exhibited in the gospel of Jesus! There we read of one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in us all. That it is his gracious intention to save and render eternally happy all his intelligent offspring. There we behold no mighty devil to blacken the moral horizon, or frustrate and baffle the designs of the Deity. But on the contrary, a religion all mild and beautiful, that breathes nothing but pure benevolence, and evidently indicates the approximation of a period, in which truth will completely triumph over error, and happiness be universal. Amen!

WESTERN ASSOCIATION

OF UNIVERSALISTS, IN THE STATE OF N. YORK.

The ministers, messengers and delegates, constituting the Western Association of Universalists, assembled in the School-house at Fly-Creek, town of Otsego, according to adjournment the past year, on Wednesday morning, June 4, 1823; and opened the council with solemn prayer, by Br. Underwood. Appointed Br. N. Stacy moderator. Brs. S. R. Smith, and Pitt Morse, clerks.

CIRCULAR LETTER FOR 1823.

The Western Association of Universalists in an-

ual session in Otsego, county of Otsego, June 4th and 5th, 1823.—To the several churches, societies, and individuals in fellowship, and to *all* of every sect, order, and denomination, to whom this epistle shall come: Wishing grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dear beloved in the Lord—With renewed sensations of gratitude to God, we present to you the doings of the Western Association, on the 18th session from its first organization. By which you will learn that an increased number of ministering brethren attended: that four new societies were added to the association; two brethren, who have recently entered into the labors of the Universal Husbandman, not through the instrumentality of *theological seminaries*, but under the divine tuition of him who *teaches not for doctrine the commandments of men*, but who teaches, and *'speaketh as never man spake,'* received letters of fellowship; three brethren received ordination, and three new branch associations were established within the former limits of this association. The business of the council was conducted with that candour, Christian charity and affection, which should ever characterize the disciples of our divine Master. Our brethren who were called to the desk, spoke with the demonstration of the spirit, and with power; while, as if to consummate our felicity on this happy occasion, a numerous auditory, consisting of, at least, between two and three thousand, gave unwearied and devout attention to the word.

Brethren—You feel unspeakably interested in the promulgation of that *truth* which has happified your souls, and made them free. What then can fill your mind with more delightful sensations, and raise your souls with more sincere exercises of gratitude to the beneficent Author of our religion, than to a retrospect for a few moments, and compare our infancy in this part of the heritage of our Lord, with the present state of the Universal church?

But a few years have elapsed since the seed of this blessed hope was first sown in these parts through the instrumentality of the preached word. Eighteen years ago this season, the feeble instrument who now has the honour of addressing you, first visited this western country. But a solitary society, organized the preceding year, and three ministering brethren, myself making the third, exclusive of the city of N. York, were all that could be mustered in this state. Our labours were indefatigable amidst conflicting, and to every being except those who were able to trust in the living God who is the Saviour of all men, discouraging scenes. And although some extremely unpleasant events took place, which shortly afterwards lopped off one from our little connexion, still the truth gradually took in the minds of some, and an enlarged field for labourers began to open.

In July, that season, we appointed, and held a conference in the town of Burlington, county of Otsego, in which our few ministering brethren, and a number of believers from the adjacent towns assembled. And seeing the want of labourers in this part of the vineyard of our Lord, we unanimously

agreed to apply to the general convention of New-England for a visiting committee, to meet with us the next year, and assist in organizing an association in this region. Our prayer was heard. And the June following, we met in the town of Columbus as an association, for the first time in the state of N. York. A small congregation attended. No consecrated dome opened its gilded doors for our reception; but the verdurous foliage of the forest constituted our canopy, and the trunks and fragments of fallen trees our seats. There we listened with a rapture never before realized by us, to a dispensation of the word of life. Our eastern brethren, (H. Ballou, P. Dean, and J. Flagg,) laboured, and their labours were not in vain. The spark took, the flame began to enkindle, and the truth to triumph. And although her progress has not been attended with that rapidity that characterizes an awakening, founded upon the fermentation of heated passions, yet she has walked forth in the majesty of her strength, and borne down all opposition, (for every thing has been opposed to her that the ingenuity of the carnal mind could invent,) not by dint of human literature, nor the strong hand of civil authority, but by the energy of *her own power*; till she starts, a giant, putting "to flight the armies of the aliens!" Where you then saw three societies, (for three were all that were represented in the first association,) you now see not only three score and six, for this excludes the numerous societies belonging to the Genesee branch, but you may look farther west, and south, and see in the state of Ohio, societies, churches, and associations, and even in Indiana and other states, societies arising in rapid succession!

With this view before us, who, among us, but must feel their hearts glow with those sincere exercises of gratitude to "the Author and finisher of our faith," which shall stimulate to a renewed resolution to persevere, by divine grace, in the heavenly calling? Not only in holding fast the profession of faith without wavering, but by adhering inflexibly to the life-giving precepts of our divine Redeemer. For in vain, brethren, do we recommend the excellency of our religion to the world, while our daily deportment shows a total indifference to its sacred injunctions. If you wish, then, to see the universal spread of the gospel of life, show that there is a divine reality in it. Practise that self-denial, that forbearance, that unanimity among yourselves, that charity and love towards enemies, and all mankind, which it demands, and you will exhibit to the world that it makes man happy, and they will receive it.

Brethren in the ministry, while your hands are made strong, and your hearts glad, by the increase of your numbers, while the opposers of the doctrine you inculcate recede from an ingenuous contest, enabling you to take the field in triumph, be affectionately admonished ever to recollect from whence your help cometh, and whence our victory is obtained. It is not because you are men of more profound erudition, of superior natural endowments, or of more scrutinizing discernment; but because God has been pleased to give you an un-

derstanding of *his truth*; evincing the divine authenticity of that sound-testimony, "the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong." Therefore be humble. Let not the enemy get an advantage over you by inflating your vanity, or puffing you up with spiritual pride. Rejoice not over a fallen enemy, "but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven;" and that you discover Salvation equally sure to all our race. Study to maintain a meek and quiet spirit. Treat with becoming tenderness all who oppose you; and by a "patient continuance in well doing," put to silence the tongue of slander.

To those who are wavering, to those who are seeking, and to those who feel essentially opposed to the doctrines we embrace, we would simply observe, in the fear of God; that the great object of our pursuit is *TRUTH*. We would not embrace error ourselves, nor invite others thereunto. But after a faithful and prayerful investigation, we are fully persuaded of the truth of what we declare; and of its salutary and happy influence upon mankind: We affectionately invite you to a dispassionate examination. If you have no interest in supporting error, and we are well persuaded you can have no genuine interest, why shrink from exposing your sentiments for public investigation? If you are honest seekers after truth, why unwilling to examine all things, prove all things, that you may "hold fast that which is good?" Permit us, dear friends, to exhort you, for the sake of your dearest interest, your best good, to give the sentiments you have espoused, as well as all others presented to you, a close and critical examination, prayerfully comparing them with the divine word. And we firmly believe you will be undeceived, and be enabled to rejoice in the full assurance, that God will "gather together in *ONE* all things in Christ; both which are in heaven, and which are on the earth, even in him."

Finally—Brethren, sisters, and friends, may God be graciously pleased to direct us all by the spirit of Heavenly Wisdom, while in this tabernacle, and give us, at last, "a seat among them that are sanctified." Amen. By order.

NATHANIEL STACY.

From the New-England Galaxy.

A VIOLENT TEMPEST

Happened at Montville, in Connecticut, on Sunday the 25th ult. from a description of which, in a Norwich paper, we take the following extract.

"As a singular coincidence we would remark, that no sooner had their Reverend Pastor finished reading a hymn, at the opening of divine service, beginning with these words—

Methinks the last great day is come,
Methinks I hear the trumpet sound;
That shakes the earth, reads every tomb,
And wakes the prisoners under ground,

than a stroke of lightning struck the top of the cupola of the Presbyterian meeting-house—shattered the belfrey—entered the body of the house—split to shivers several posts—broke most of the glass, and several window sashes—shivered to atoms seve-

ral pews, and instantly sent two *HUMAN BEINGS* into eternity. Several other persons were seriously wounded; among them were two young ladies, who were so severely injured, as to render it necessary to carry them home on beds. We are happy to state that they are on the recovery. The persons killed were Mrs. Betsey Bradford, widow of the late Mr. Perez Bradford, aged 72 years, and Miss Mary S. Comstock, daughter of Capt. John R. Comstock, aged 9 years. The consternation into which the congregation was thrown, on this awful occasion, can be more easily imagined than described."

This event was truly awful, and must have filled every person present with terror, and excited the most solemn reflections. But how does it happen that those who see a special judgment in every physical operation of nature, have neither made this occurrence a theme for moralizing, nor held it up as an awful warning to persons who go to meeting on a Sabbath day? If a boat is upset by a squall, if a house takes fire, or if a carriage is broken, on the Sabbath, and lives are lost, or limbs shattered, some pious favourite of the Deity pretends to see in the event a manifestation of divine displeasure. Suppose a theatre had been struck with lightning and two human beings sent instantly into eternity, would not all the pretended *elect* have declared it a special judgment, an awful warning to mortals to keep from the theatre? Or suppose a person had been drowned while bathing—an act necessary to preserve health, and as much a positive command of God as any other which man performs—on the Sabbath day, would not these men, who are so jealous for the glory of the Almighty, have made the welkin ring with their denunciations against the Sabbath-breaker, and declared that the death was a just punishment for the profanation of the holy day?

Is not the event above related equally a token of vengeance, an expression of God's wrath against sin? And ought it not to be a solemn warning to the people of Montville, never again to enter a meeting-house on the Sabbath day? should it not especially be a caution to ministers to refrain from reading passages of hymns, which, like the above, anticipate the day of doom?

Arrogant, presumptuous men, who darken counsel by words without knowledge! Ye hypocrites, who pretend to possess the confidence and the secrets of the Almighty! When will ye know and acknowledge that he who made you,

"The Great First Cause,
Acts not by partial, but by general laws;
And sees, with equal eye, as God of all,
A hero perish, or a sparrow fall:
Atoms or systems into ruin hurld,
And now a bubble burst, and now a world!"

FROM "PLAIN TRUTH."

Wanted, immediately, Seven Thousand Orthodox Ministers in the United States.

A writer in the Boston Recorder, under the appropriate signature of "Minimus," gives us the following: "Much has been written of late upon the urgent call for labourers in the Lord's vineyard. It

has been often stated, that one minister is wanted for every 1000 souls in our land, and that to furnish this supply of competent religious teachers, SEVEN THOUSAND are now wanted. But though the people greatly need the instruction of faithful and able ministers, equal in number to more than one to every 1000 souls; yet but a small part of this number could obtain support." This is a candid and honest confession. All the learned professions are crowded—the story of vacancies for clergymen is an idle dream. No doubt there are vacancies for priests, lawyers, and doctors at Kamtschatka and at Symmesonia, but can they be supported? The orthodox have asserted that there was an actual scarcity of ministers in our country—but it is the most barefaced falsity that ever was uttered—the most pious fraud that was ever played off. We have 700 lawyers in the state of New-York—"yet but a small number can obtain support." Every thing is over done—every avenue is crowded with hungry applicants for business, excepting agriculture. Let our beneficiaries turn their attention to farming, and instead of eating rice with the Hindoos, eat hasty pudding with their wives and children in America. Our country wants capital and productive hands, and our young men should banish the insane idea of converting Hindoos, and settle down like good citizens.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

A CONTRADICTION

Of False Statements and Wilful Misrepresentations, as contained in the Gospel Herald of June 28, 1823.

Mr. Editor—It is hoped that the following will have as early a place in your paper as possible, and that it will be a sufficient caution to Mr. J. Ditchett, to take heed how he hears in future, and more especially what he publishes. For with what measure ye mete, says our Lord, it shall be measured to you again.

We, the undersigned, having heard the Rev. Mr. Roy's discourse in the Court House in Newark, on Sunday June 15, do certify, that he did not say (as has been very unjustly stated in the Gospel Herald, No. 7.) "*The prodigal son was the son of God*;" on the other hand, he clearly and distinctly mentioned in his introduction, that the Parable was designed by our Lord to represent the Jewish and Gentile nations. By the elder brother, he observed our Lord meant the Jew, by the younger, the Gentile, who was about to return to him, from whom he had so deeply revolted.

2. He did not say, "*That if the people gave only one dollar to the support of the poor, he should see that their names should be written in God's eternal book of life.*" The quotations which he made on the occasion, were the following—"Never turn away thy face from any poor man, and the Lord will never turn away his face from thee. He that hath pity on the poor lendeth unto the Lord, and that which he layeth out shall be paid him again." It is most generally the case, said he, that they are repaid in this life. The King himself, he observed, would say to his children in that day, "Come ye blessed

of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, thirsty and ye gave me drink, sick and in prison and ye visited me," &c. Mr. R. had understood that a collection was to have been taken up on the occasion.

3. He did not say, "*That to his certain knowledge, there were twenty ministers in New-York who had turned from their former faith*;" but that he had known nearly that number since he came to reside there, (which has been thirteen years) who had departed from the faith of the Gospel, and embraced false and pernicious principles, and even become faithful and zealous propagators of them. He might have known some of those in different places where he has been since he came to that city.

4. He did not say, "*That Universalists were worse than Atheists and Deists.*" We presume, that if either of the latter had heard the discourse alluded to, they would have had more candour than to misrepresent what they could not comprehend.

Signed,

*I. SYTHOFF,	ARON THOMPSON,
JAMES C. OGDEN,	CALVIN FREEMAN,
WM. H. HYATT,	ZENAS CONNET,
WATERS B. JONES,	GEORGE ROHDE.
HICKFORD FERRIS,	

Newark, July 23, 1823.

* Coll Sythoff.

N. B. There are only two or three of the above members of the Methodist Episcopal Church; the others are men of respectability, who belong to different denominations. W. R.

REMARKS.

We are in duty bound to correct, so far as is possible, all false and incorrect statements which have been published in this Paper, &c. Of D. J.'s account, we, not being present at the time, of course cannot be a voucher. "He is of age, he can speak for himself." We have only to say, that the most prominently objectionable assertions charged by D. J. to W. R.'s account, remain even without being hinted at, much less denied or qualified. W. R. and his friends, evidently labour under mistake in this particular—D. J.'s declaration, that W. R. asserted "that the prodigal was the son of God, and the devil had no right to hold him in slavery," &c. by no means implies that the prodigal is Jesus Christ. We presume this was not intended. It appears W. R. has varied the phraseology. We think this is unjustifiable; also that it is puerile for any person to multiply words to prove the proper affinity of the parties, when the words "*Father*" and "*sons*," are used in the passage.

D. J., if he pleases, can publish a defence if he conceives one to be necessary, and the matter will be at an end.

ED. GOS. HER.

"*The love of Money is the root of all evil.*"

SCRIPTURE.

That man is, strictly speaking, a benefactor of his fellow man, who ameliorates his condition in any manner whatever. The opportunities afforded by a kind Providence of doing good, are various and

multiform. Good may be communicated directly, by the bestowment of necessities; and indirectly by advice, tending to the acquisition of the means requisite to the attainment of a valuable object. The latter is all the boon which our present labours can lay claim to; in the good advice we are now about giving to our brethren. The avoiding an evil, is better than remedying its effects after it has befallen one. Now, if the "*love of money* is the *root* of all evil," the "*love of money*," must be a very great evil in itself. For, as the *root*, so also are the *branches*. An evil *root*, must produce evil *fruit*.

What is *evil*? Ans. Every thing that is not *good*. What is the *love* of a thing? Ans. It is the *desire* of it. It is the value of the thing, in the estimation of the possessor, or in the mind of him who is in pursuit of it. No man will desire or love any thing which he is persuaded is destitute of any value. The poisonous cup, charged with convulsions and death, is sought for on account of the quietus it brings, and the association of revenge or forgetfulness with its influences. Now in giving any thing for another's benefit, insanity itself knows better than to bestow an useless good for nothing appendage. Mankind are so constituted, that there is a similarity in all their *real* wants and desires. That which is useful to one man, is also useful to another, and to every other under the same circumstances. Circumstances, however, may exist, when one man, differently situated, may actually suffer from the absence of his portion of the goods supplied by Providence, and another suffer from the conscious possession of more than he needs, and the knowledge that he is unnecessarily withholding from his brother a needful blessing, while the possession of it can do himself no good. Here the *love* of the thing possessed is unnatural and wicked, and is the root of all the evils occasioned by the hoarding in useless obscurity, and rendering a curse, the blessings provided for another.

The word *money* may have a general signification, and, in the sense used in our motto, be applied to all the common gifts of God, which were designed by their *use*, to assist mankind temporarily; but which by their *abuse*, prove a curse to the possessor.

We could instance various ways in which "*the love of money* is the *root* of all evil." We could illustrate this position, by portraying, in glowing colours, the complicated wretchedness occasioned by it. From the wild career of the mad man's ambition, and the griping carefulness of the miser, morals might be obtained, as useful as their source is degrading to mankind.

It is sufficient for us, on the present occasion, to point out some of the benefits resulting from a contrary course; and to *lure* by the love of benevolence, and the humane sympathies of the creature, so congenial with his being, instead of coercing by a frightful host of horrors, the consequences of improper passions, marshaled in terrible array, and reproving the tardy obedience of the sluggish soul, chained down in degrading servitude to "yellow dirt."

Man, viewed in the great medium of God's purposes and their ultimate accomplishment, is a noble

being, lifted far above the little puerile vanities of the present passing scene. I see him, on angel's wings, soaring, a bright seraph, to the courts of heaven. His eyes once blinded, and his ken narrowed to discern the toys and pageantry of this little speck, now expand in glorious vision, piercing the vast unnumbered fields of ether, and roaming in unbounded felicity in distant worlds. Ask him there to prize the gilded toys of earthly folly and childish magnificence. To stay his pinions, and count the glittering dust, or ponder the goods of mortal prize. He heeds you not. The love of *money* is swallowed up in the love of *man*, and man's great Author, *God*. Reader, the hour of regret must come. The acid of remorse will superabound, and the sweets of folly be destroyed, in the cool reflection of wisdom's hour. Would you be wise? Be wise then for yourself, and be wise in time. The regret of after years, and the remorse of future retrospection, will only count the golden opportunity as gone, and the chance for doing good, as passed by, never, never to return. Would you transfer your *love*, and leaving the deceitful path, where error cheats the soul, prize those things which are susceptible of your sympathy, and can reciprocate your affection; love *man*. Prefer the Godlike image, whose affinity with yours claim relationship with heaven, and who is bound with you, and the whole family of man, to a common and peaceful home.

The "*root of all evil*," is surely a poisonous and baleful root. When growing in the mind of man, the corruption extends far and wide, suppressing the emotions of the soul, and destroying the best feelings of human kind. What then is the remedy in this desperate disease? What can uproot this evil weed, and make room for plants of heavenly birth? Ans. *Reason*. The wisdom from above; which is "pure, gentle, easy to be entreated, *full of mercy* and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy." This is the only remedy. This will destroy the root, and annihilate, by its heavenly influences, every fibre of the accursed plant. Are you, reader, afflicted with the disease? Apply the remedy. Exchange the sordid views of griping calculation, for pure and gentle feelings, easy to be entreated, and alive to the wants and sufferings of others. Instead of the insensibility, the fruit of this baleful root, which can hear unmoved the cries of misery, and see the sufferings of a fellow man, fill your heart with mercy, be impartial in all your conduct and decisions, and without hypocrisy in all your ways.

The Presbyterian congregation at New-Hartford, Oneida county, have been for several years deficient in the payments of their priest, until the arrearages amounted to about six hundred dollars. He proposed to deduct one hundred dollars from that balance, if they would pay the remainder. They kept up a missionary society of fifty-four members, and at the same time could not or would not perform their obligations to *their own priest*.

By what law of the Christian religion are they bound to send the gospel abroad, when they are not able to keep it alive at home? And how is it that these things are so? *Plain Truth.*

ANOTHER CONVERSION IN THE MINISTRY.

Elias Smith, who for some time past has been Pastor of the 3d Universalist Society, in the city of Boston, has publicly renounced the Universalist doctrine. In giving publicity to the foregoing, we copy the example of Universalist Editors, who uniformly emblazon, in their respective papers, the most trifling accessions to their ministry from other denominations. We waive further remarks, on the above occurrence, for the present.

Gospel Palladium.

REMARKS.

The above is extracted from the "PALLADIUM," a very liberal paper, published in Warren, Rhode-Island. We should be gratified, could we learn who the other minister was,—the phrase "Another Conversion in the Ministry," will do very well when it is appropriate! The fact is, we can count them in round numbers; but our brother of the Palladium will, we think, find it difficult to justify himself in the use of the phrase. Our thanks will be given to any person who will name the volume and page of the Gospel Herald, which contains the account of Elias Smith's conversion to the faith of the salvation of all men. Those who know Elias Smith, very well know, that his reputation for being often converted is unrivalled. There is not a timeserving politician in the country, who has shifted his opinions and principles, one half the number of times that Elias Smith has been converted! He has shoved himself into the circle of almost every religious sect; and after asserting his belief in their doctrines, looked for another path, and denied the truth of his previous sentiments.

All we have to say of this business is—If Elias Smith *professed* for a time to believe in the doctrine of the salvation of all men, and has now again faced about, and *professes* to believe something else, we are *very glad* of it! We will not knowingly acknowledge any but those, who "with the *heart* believe unto righteousness, and with the *mouth* make confession unto salvation." Those who *believe*, as well as *confess*, with the *mouth*, are not the characters nor persons we acknowledge as Universalists. The phrase "Another conversion," &c. will not answer the purpose, unless the celebrated and Rev. Mr. T. will serve our friend of the Palladium to *begin* with. If he will answer, he can be had cheap, and the story will tell much better!

Note. We have been requested to publish the names of all Ministers who have been converted to the true faith, in this country, &c. Thinking it probable we might omit some names, we request our brother Editors who advocate the true faith, to do the same, and we shall endeavour to keep a correct account for the accommodation of our readers.

NOTICE.

The General Convention of Universalists of the New-England states and others, will be holden in the village of Clinton, town of Paris, and county of Oneida, (N. Y.) on the third Wednesday and Thursday in September next.

SELECTED FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—The following Poem, transcribed from an English periodical work, I send for insertion in the Gospel Herald, believing that through the medium of your paper, it may meet the eye of many who have not had the pleasure of seeing it. Yours respectfully. E. P. A.

Let that arithmetician come
Can multiply a boundless sum;
In figures can produce a draught,
Beyond his pen, beyond his thought,
Can join the various numbers made
E'er since the poles of heaven were laid.
Upon your tables first descry
The tapers of the galaxy,
With all the lamps that heaven adorn,
And all the pearls of dewy morn,
Tell all the vital rills that flow,
Through all the veins of earth below,
With upper streams, whose large command
Distributes plenty o'er the land.
Tell all the chrystal tears that rise
And fall from weeping nature's eyes;
And fleecy locks that ever spread
Her limbs with nature's coverlid.
And then into thy numbers bring
The tender infants of the spring;
Their features and proportions tell,
And their complexions and their smell.
Then clusters count which vineyards dress,
Whose juice intoxicates the press,
And all the stores the orchard yields
When rich September crowns the fields;
Each single grain of corn run o'er,
Which plenteous harvest ever bore.
Count leaves that fall, when winter's breeze
Does comb the woods and poll the trees;
And all the lives that fruitful earth,
And pregnant seas did e'er bring forth.
Go on, and don't one atom spare
That dances up and down the air,
Nor finest thread that ever suits
The shaggy garments of the brutes;
Nor smallest hair that ever spread
An ornament on human head.
Then add the numerous sands that be
The chains of the enraged sea;
And all the spires that e'er were seen
To clothe the fields with native green.
Let myriads then of years be run,
As moments past since time begun;
Yet still Eternity surmounts
By endless flight your vast accounts.
What mind, my friend, can fully state
The glories of their happy fate,
Who freed from vice and cleansed from sin,
Feel, pleasing thought! a heaven within;
Who from the exhaustless source of joy,
Are fill'd with bliss which ne'er can cloy!

Such is the fate design'd for man,
When perfected the gracious plan,
Form'd by Him who reigns above,
Whose choicest name is sovereign Love,
When sin and death by his decree
Are swallow'd up in victory.
Let all these years be pass'd away
There still remains an endless day;
Yea, if by joining millions more
You still enhance the nameless score,
When all these ages they have seen
Eternity does but begin.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET,
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV: NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1823.

NO. 13.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—My motive in writing the following letters was, to bring about a friendly interview between the Rev. Mr. M'Dowell and my family, as my wife is a member of his church. But all my exertions, notwithstanding the desire of my *sick* wife, failed. Believing that some good may result from having the letters published, I request you to insert them in the Gospel Herald. WILLIAMS WOOLLEY.

Morristown, June 1, 1823.

TO THE REV. WM. A. M'DOWELL.

Sir—In consequence of hearing you preach this morning and evening, I take the liberty of addressing a few lines to you, hoping you will receive them in love. For if I know any thing of myself, it is that only which causes me to write at this time, although I may differ in sentiment from you.

In respect to your morning discourse, I would remark, that I think a preacher should be considered in the character of a *witness*, that is called upon to give evidence; that is, the *whole* truth, and nothing but the truth; and that on both sides of the question. Therefore, when you represent the consequences of sin, you should not clear one from punishment who is guilty, whether he be of the *elect* or non-elect: whether God's people or the devil's; whether your people or my people. For, Sir, I think that the word of God is plain, that he will reward *every* man according to his works. On the other hand, when you quoted the word of God for the consolation of your people or hearers, as you did this morning, it gave me pain to observe that you omitted, as I thought, the best part of the testimony in a number of texts, as for instance—"He is the propitiation for *our* sins." Why do you not give your people all the verse, which reads—"He is the propitiation for *our* sins; and not for *ours* only, but also for (the sins of) the *whole* world?" Will you be so kind as to answer me this?

This evening your text was, "Know ye not, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived." In the first place you acknowledge that the *kingdom of God*, &c. in a number of passages, had reference to his Spiritual Kingdom in *this* mode of being. But, in this passage, you asserted that it did not; but that it was in a *future* state. On examining the context, I must beg leave to differ from you, unless you can give me further light on the subject. Now, Sir, the apostle informs us, that the "Kingdom of heaven is within you;" or us, &c. That is, I think in believers, those who are delivered from fear and doubt; they, and they only inherit the kingdom of

God, that is spoken of in your text. Therefore I do firmly believe, that if you, or any of your people, have doubts (let alone Christ,) in that case you do not inherit the kingdom of God. For he that doubteth is damned. So says the testimony. And if we speak not according to the testimony, it is because there is no light in us. But, blessed be God, the time is coming when *all* shall be taught of God, and know God, from the least unto the greatest. Then, doubts, fears, sin, unrighteousness, &c. and misery, which is the consequence, will cease: This is the faith of Universalists.

Sir, if the intention of your discourse was to represent the preaching of Universalists this evening, and to guard your people against hearing them, I would advise you to come *yourself*, and hear for once, before you again attempt to represent us; and your candour will prevent you, I think, from misrepresenting. For I have that respect for you to believe, that you do not wish to misrepresent, and that you have never heard our doctrine for yourself. Should any of your people *venture* to come and hear, they will find that we preach quite *differently* from your representation made this evening. Instead of preaching the *devil's* doctrine, that man shall *not* die on the day of his transgression, we preach that he shall. That man is punished on the *day* he transgresses, &c.

As it is now late at night, I must forbear, hoping you will write to me, or call and see us some time this week. But should you think me *unworthy* of your attention, I would entreat you to reconsider. For I acknowledge that I am zealously engaged in circulating what I conceive to be truth; which is that "God is the Saviour of *all* men, especially of those that believe." And you must acknowledge, that I have been instrumental either in the hand of God or the devil, in making proselytes. If I am *wrong*, I should be glad to be informed. Should you *refuse* to instruct me, will you not be accountable to your God, on your own principles?

From your friend, &c.

WILLIAMS WOOLLEY.

Morristown, July 21, 1823.

TO THE REV. WM. A. M'DOWELL,

Sir—On the first of June last, I addressed a letter to you, in which I made some remarks on two sermons that I heard you deliver that day; and asked you some questions, &c. and requested you either to answer my letter, or call and see us that week. As you previously *promised* me to call and visit myself and wife, I therefore expected you, especially as she was then *sick*, and has been the

most of the time since. And farther, as she is a member of your society.

As *seven weeks* have passed away, and I have heard nothing from you, I now address the second letter. Perhaps you will ask, why you should visit us, as we are both Universalists? I will answer: One reason is this, your brother at Elizabeth-Town, and a doctor of divinity too, has, sometime back acknowledged that he was acquainted with a lady of that faith, who died a Universalist, and, notwithstanding, was a *Christian*, and would be saved, &c. Should you visit Mrs. Woolley, now supposed to be in the last stage of consumption, peradventure you might be constrained, and that freely, to make the same confession. This was at that time a consolation to a dear sister of mine, who is *now suffering in the wilderness*, for no other *sin* than *unbelief*. For had she believed that Jesus Christ was what he *is*, the Saviour of the *world, all men*, she would not have *sacrificed* herself, as she now has. And had doctors (of divinity) in general, made the same honest acknowledgement with your brother, I think she might have been saved from the imprudent act. But your brother stood alone. He was but one among thousands. Perhaps you may be surprised, and doubt the correctness of this. If so, I assure you it can be proved to your satisfaction, and by respectable witnesses that heard the conversation.

Another reason why I wished you to visit us is, because *you promised* me that you would do so, and that *shortly*. Another is, that I wished you to become acquainted with our sentiments. For if they are *bad*, it is necessary that you should know them, in order to guard your people against them. On the other hand, if you should find them to be *good*, (and I think you will if you examine them,) it will be your duty to embrace them, &c. Another reason why I wish you to visit me is, that you may answer to my letter of June 1st.

On the other hand, I do not wish you to visit Mrs. W. for the purpose of destroying her peace and happiness, here and hereafter; although it is impossible that you or any other person can defeat her future happiness. But if you can add to her present faith and happiness, you will receive our thanks. And should that spirit of liberality be in you, that was in your brother, it would be a consolation to myself, and likewise to her in her last hours.

In your sermon alluded to in my last letter, of June 1st, you quoted a passage of Scripture that represents the devil like a roaring lion, going about seeking whom he may devour. This I think you wished should apply to an advocate of Universal Salvation, who preached here, a short time before, at my house; as you quoted a small part of his discourse, on the goodness of God, &c. Or else you quoted the passage to prove that Universal salvation could not be true, as there were some to be destroyed by this "roaring lion." In order to answer this, I will attempt to give you my understanding of the passage. In doing this, I will give your Mrs. Woolley's case as a figure to illustrate it. When she was taught to believe that God had elected a large proportion of the souls he had made

for an *eternal hell*, there to be tormented with fire and brimstone as long as God exists, together with all the horrors that are described in this doctrine, she was miserable indeed, and had no rest day nor night. But on the contrary, when she believed that "in Christ *all* the nations and families of the earth shall be *blessed*;" when she believed that God was the Saviour and Friend of her children, husband, and connexions, and of *all men*, (as he really is,) then she entered into *rest*. Thus she has for a long time believed, and the approach or thoughts of death, seems rather to strengthen her faith than otherwise. Now, Sir, could you *destroy* her *confidence*, and her views of the testimony of God, it might well be said, that you had destroyed a Universalist, and with it you would destroy all her present happiness. In that case it might be said, that you had destroyed her peace. For the instant that you could prevail on her to believe the horrible doctrine (which is nowhere to be found in the Scriptures*) of *eternal punishment* and death, for a large portion of the race of Adam, she would have no peace left. There would remain nothing but fear, doubt, trouble and affliction, awaiting her, as with your people and yourself; for you have asserted, that no one can be delivered from doubts, &c. in *this* mode of being.

Now, Sir, Mrs. W. believes firmly in the doctrine of universal grace and salvation. If you believe firmly that she will be *eternally punished*, unless she repents of this her faith, in this life, is it not your duty to visit, and admonish her, let the consequences be what they may, to abandon such a faith, although it now gives her consolation? I humbly think, Sir, it is. On the other hand, if her faith is of God, and founded on his word, and you should attempt to destroy it, would not *you* come under the character of a "roaring lion, seeking whom you might devour?" Should you succeed, would not God reward you for it? Cannot God reward you, without making you *endlessly* miserable? These, my dear Sir, are serious questions, which I wish you to consider, and to act accordingly.

I would further state, that I always have esteemed you as a man, and have no enmity against you, or your happiness. But it is the reverse, which makes you miserable and unhappy, that I would wish to destroy. It is that God-dishonouring and man-destroying doctrine of *endless* misery for the wicked; for all are wicked. It is for the wicked that Christ was sent.

I cannot close this, my second letter, without informing you, that, this morning when I was returning home, I saw a man in black clothing passing by my house, and instead of turning in, and visiting his *sick neighbour*, he turned away on the other side! I made inquiry who it was, and was informed that it was the *Rev. Mr. McDowell*. I had a right to think, and I leave you to conjecture my thoughts.

* Some of Mr. M.D.'s congregation may consider this declaration to be false, but the Scriptures nowhere contain such doctrine. The Rev. Mr. Thompson of Connecticut Farms, said, in Mr. M.D.'s pulpit, that Dan. xii. 2, had a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and not to the last judgment. Think of this!

Before I close, I will anticipate one objection that you will make to answering my letters. You will, perhaps, say, they are so badly written and spelled, that you cannot understand them. If that should be the case, will you please to call on me, and I will explain any part of them that is unintelligible. Should you still refuse, in that case I must have them *plainly printed*, in order that your congregation may judge between you and me. If you ask—In what paper? I answer—In that paper which is so much despised by a few of your people; but is read weekly by a large portion of them; the GOSPEL HERALD.

From your friend, and brother in Christ,

The rejected WILLIAMS WOOLLEY.

REMARKS.

Whatever may be the real merits or motives of professors and preachers of the Christian Religion, so called, they invariably strive "to make clean the outside of the platter." They profess to have the Lord Jesus Christ for their pattern, and to imitate him, both in his principles and practice. Although it is not our province to sit in judgment on our fellow sinners, much less to condemn them to an eternal (or endless) hell, for differing with us in sentiment, still we are authorized to decide on the conduct of professors of religion, and mark the difference which may exist between them and the Lord whom they profess to serve and imitate. There is an obvious reason for this. When men are held up as examples, and they boldly claim respect for their holiness, and attention to their commands and exhortations, predicated the whole upon the sacredness of their office, their learning, wisdom, and goodness, it is proper that their pretensions should be weighed in an even balance, and their merits appear as honestly possessed, as they are strenuously contended for.

We have heard of those who call straight crooked, and crooked straight. Light darkness, and darkness light. Good evil, and evil good. If our present lucubrations should fall into the hands of this description of Christians, we shall expect no mercy for ourselves, nor approbation for our *truth*. For those who call good *evil*, and evil *good*, as a matter of course, will preserve their consistency and condemn every thing which assimilates with the honesty, the meekness, and the love of Christ. The tables will be turned in their mind, in a moment. To be the *reverse* of every thing compatible with humanity and the Christian character, with these logicians will be good, while every Godlike sentiment and action, will be stigmatized as evil.

We purpose to address ourselves, respectfully, to the Rev. Mr. M'Dowell, as being the chief of the opposing party. And we declare, at the onset, that we mean no offence. We shall "use great plainness of speech." Our reason follows—Mr. M'D. is a man of like passions, and as much interested for himself as others can be for him. Besides, we wish him to understand us. We would do him good. If he has any excessences which shoot out of a corrupt heart and imagination, the sooner they are lopped off the better. If he is a *good* tree, stately,

comely, and so forth, the axe will pass without wounding, and leave even his bark unhurt. If, on the other hand, his eye has offended, he had better pluck it out. For it is better for him to enter into the kingdom of God with *one* eye, than having two eyes, to be cast into *hell fire*. (Mark ix.)

Rev. Sir—When the Lord Jesus Christ was upon earth, he conducted in a manner, which, if you were to imitate, would not disgrace you. He went about doing good, and healing all manner of diseases. He visited *sinners*! Strange to relate, he never refused the invitations and solicitations of sinners, however they might have differed with him in sentiment, even in *health*, but visited them, and eat and drank at their tables. In *sickness*, his ready feet and willing mind, moved to the house of the wicked, and the vilest were not beneath *his* notice. True, the *holy* men of the day, the Pharisees; whom Christ called *serpents*, and a *generation of vipers*, reproved him, and spoke reproachfully of him, because he noticed *sinners*. Never did the mouth of Jesus utter reproof so pointedly against any class of men, as against the *pious* men, the Pharisees of old! They, hypocrites as they were, made great pretensions, exalted themselves, and stigmatized and debased others. But Jesus, the meek and lowly lamb of God, addressing a mixed multitude, said, "One is your Master Christ; and all ye are *brethren*. And call no *man* your father upon the earth; for one is your *Father* which is in heaven." Matt. xxiii. We appeal to you, Sir, and ask, Is not this very different from your advice, recently given to your congregation, when you exhorted them not to have any intercourse whatever with Universalists, neither in the ordinary civilities and sociabilities of life, nor in marriage? Was there not something of the *Pharisee* in this? Do you imitate Christ, when you neglect and *refuse* to visit a *sick* woman, and that woman a *member of your church*, because she differs in her religious opinions with you? Is not your conduct precisely the same with those Jews, who said, "*Stand by, come not near unto me, for I am holier than thou?*"

Sir, "This wisdom descendeth *not from above*, but is *earthly, sensual devilish*. For where envying and strife is there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." (James iii. 15-17.) We leave you to judge for yourself, Sir, whether your wisdom is "*easy to be entreated*," taking Mrs. Woolley's case into view, and whether it is "*full of mercy*," &c. "*without partiality and without hypocrisy*." Or whether you were not influenced by the wisdom which is from beneath, which is neither gentle nor easy to be entreated, and is *empty* of mercy, partial, &c. We are not your judge. To your God you stand or fall. And farther, Sir, we assure you, that were your conduct more significant of hatred and malice than it is at present, and your words more bitter, we should *pity* your blindness, and not consign you to an *endless* hell! We consider you as a *brother*, but at present a very *unkind* one. And

we rejoice even of you, that your works shall be tried by fire, and you will be saved. "For if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but *he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.*" (1 Cor. iii.) To this *purifying fire* we consign you, Sir, while you, *horrible to relate*, consign us to *interminable burnings!!!* O horrible! O most horrible! If to do this, Sir, is to be "*full of mercy*," pray tell, we beseech you, what it is to have *no mercy?*

There is one feature in your ministration which deserves special notice. You, Sir, advise and exhort your congregation not to *hear* Universalists preach. And you, and the active members of your church, use all your influence to enslave the minds of the inhabitants of Morristown generally, and to prevent their reading or hearing any thing explanatory of our faith. Pray, Sir, is *error* so potent that you dare not meet it? Or have you *doubts* of your own correctness, and *fear to come to the light*, lest your deeds should be reprov'd? Permit us to tell you, Sir, that this conduct is an evidence of want of sincerity. Christ and his apostles were in the constant practice of visiting the Jewish synagogues. They availed themselves of all opportunities to instruct the people. The truths *they* taught will never suffer by comparison with *error*. If, Sir, your *armour is good*, why shun the combat? Are not you afraid that your *shield* will be pierced, and your *helmet* broken upon your head? Are not you accoutred with poor weapons, and pregnable armour, and fear the issue of an encounter? Paul describes the Christian's armour and weapons. *They* never failed; and the wearer of them, never turned his back to an enemy. Sir, we read, "*The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion.*"

Are your people so ignorant of the truth, that you dare not trust them to hear a doctrine which you say is contrary to Scripture, and cannot be supported? Sir, the mental man must be fed with necessary food as well as the physical man. So long as you prepare mental food in sufficient quantity, and of proper quality to nourish your hearers, you need not fear their leaving your table. But if you feed them with *husks*, their is great danger of their leaving you when they can find *bread* to eat! We must confess your policy is good, and verifies the declaration, that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." For, Sir, when your hearers eat of "the *bread of God*, which is he who cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the *world*," (all men,) they will no longer relish the *mouldy husks* of Calvin and Hopkins! You therefore do well, so far as *your* present interest and views are concerned, (contrary to the cause of Christ and the world,) to pursue your old course, and to keep the vail on the faces of your people.

Now, Sir, consider the course we recommend. We tell all Universalists, that Truth is stronger than error. We advise them, occasionally, to hear the preaching of the modern orthodox clergymen, because it will strengthen their faith. Having once

eaten the true *bread*, they will identify *husks* in a moment. We have no fears on that head. Our brethren of our faith, are too well taught to be confined in *leading-strings*! Their faith is too strong to be shaken by "every wind of doctrine." And it inspires more *courage* than to flee with an impregnable armour for their defence. Sir, truth, like its Omnipotent Author, will prevail. It shines with undiminished lustre. Its corruscations illuminate the mind, and its influences inspire the soul with vigour. At its approach, fear and doubt, disappear like the mists of the morning. Our faith is a celestial telescope of such magnitude, that it pierces the horizon of time—penetrates the darkest clouds—and beyond the atmospheres of doubt and uncertainty, rests in other worlds, and explores new and brighter heavens. What is yours? Is it not a mixture of fearful uncertainty for yourself; and a black and horrible reality for others? Your very *heaven* a bereaved place, where the sensibilities of its inmates must be blunted to possess a stoical joy, or it would ring with wretchedness for the fate of damned millions, for separated mothers and children!

To convince you, Sir, of the different spirit inculcated by the different doctrines advocated by you and us, we inform you, that, notwithstanding you have exerted yourself to prevent your congregation and others from hearing the advocates of our faith at Morristown, if you will visit this city, you shall be provided with a house to speak in, and, if you will undertake to disprove the doctrine of the salvation of *all* men, a numerous audience also. At least, we feel authorized to say on behalf of our brethren, that they would have the *courage*, and are sufficiently independent to hear you! More than this: A competent stenographer shall be provided, (if there is one in the city,) and you preach extempore, and your sermon published, and circulated, with a *few remarks, gratuitously*, to the members of your congregation. Or, Sir, if you prefer it, you may make the same offer, and it will be accepted. If our doctrine is erroneous, the sooner it is proved to be so the better. If it is truth, the sooner all men acknowledge it to be truth, and embrace it, the better. Truth can be defended. Any doctrine that will not stand the test of the closest scrutiny, is good for nothing.

To Mr. M'D's congregation we say, Paul's exhortation is, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." But how can you prove *all* things, if you hear only *one* thing? How can you reconcile the exhortation of the apostle, with your minister's narrow views and prohibitions? How can you believe that doctrine to be *good*, which will not stand the test of scrutiny? How can you confide in a doctrine, which its advocates dare not risk in open day, to candid and fair discussion? How can you find rest to your souls, under the shelter of a *bramble*? whose points tear your mind at every movement, and lacerate your hearts with cruel uncertainty? A doctrine, which its most learned advocates *know* cannot be defended by scripture, and which reason teaches, is at war with every humane sentiment and social principle. This is truth. Under its influ-

ences, your pastor has exhorted you to become *uncharitable and unkind*. The poison of its tendency is already visible in his own conduct, having steeled his heart to violate his promise, to avoid the bed of sickness, and to neglect visiting a member of his own church. Can a good tree produce such fruit? God "maketh his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute *your brethren only*, what do ye more? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as [whom? the Rev. W. A. M'Dowell? No!] your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v.)

We have said, we are not the Rev. Mr. A. M'D.'s judge. We hope he is conscientiously sincere in all his motives and principles. But, we do say, that any clergyman who refuses to hear those of another persuasion in defence of their doctrine, and who publicly misrepresents them, and uses all his influence to prejudice the public mind against them, is, with all his sincerity, conducting very differently from the commands of Jesus Christ. For "ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus. That ye put off concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness, and true holiness. Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another. Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath: neither give place to the devil." (Eph. iv. 20-27.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Two clergymen, (Messrs. Milledoler and Kuypers) and a gentleman whose name is not known, appeared before a Meeting of Trustees, Deacons and Elders of the German Lutherans, convened in the Vestry Room of that congregation, on Tuesday the 22d ult. at four o'clock, representing themselves a Delegation of the Class, on business, to say the least, of rather an extraordinary character; charging that Board with having made offers of assistance to the German Protestant Congregation, with a view to induce them to unite themselves and property with the Lutherans. Mr. Geisenheimer, pastor of the Lutheran congregation, in reply assured them, that such an overture never had been made to his knowledge, nor, as he believed, to the knowledge of any member present; if they had surplus funds, they could employ them in assisting their Lutheran brethren of St. Matthew's; if however the German Protestant Congregation was willing to join theirs, they would receive them with or without property.

Mr. Milledoler, in reply, had no objection to a personal or spiritual union of the two congregations, but to a union of property he protested; because that congregation had been for years past an onus to them, they (the Rev. Doctors) had been under a ne-

cessity of assisting and *nursing* them, &c. &c. and the summa summarum of all this is, that the property ought to be left to some few individuals who wish to unite with their establishment.

It has been supposed, that even Doctors of Divinity were, in common with human-kind, at times, allowed to blunder; but that they should be permitted to reach the superlative of simplicity, and reveal what they at all times considered their interest to conceal, (being more greedy for the fleece than the sheep,) is supposed, has not even been imagined by the most sceptic. ONE OF THE VESTRY.

Note—We give publicity to the above, at the request of the concerned. Whether they agree with us in religious sentiments generally, or not, has nothing to do with the correction of abuses, which should be a common cause; because all are interested in the honest and orderly management of every thing, whether of a temporal or spiritual nature. The parties more immediately concerned can make their own comments. The public at large is the judge. ED. GOS. HER.

"BETHEL FLAG."

The following article has recently appeared in the Christian Watchman, published in Boston.

"While each different nation has its distinctive flag, one after this manner, and another after that, it is peculiarly pleasing to observe, that there is one banner, under which Christians of all countries and of all denominations, can fight in the spiritual warfare. We refer to the Bethel flag, which is now extending its holy victories in almost every sea. A minister in the Isle of Man, formerly a midshipman in the navy, desirous of collecting his brother seamen within the sound of the glorious gospel, has written to London for a Bethel Flag, that he may hoist it there also. We wish him much success, and a rich harvest of souls."

Every man of common sense who is not blinded by sectarian prejudices, and who is not groping in darkness blacker than that of Egypt, must be surprised, on reading the above article, and desirous of information on the subject. Is it indeed the case, that the Gospel of Christ cannot be preached but under a certain FLAG to be hoisted as the signal of authority for dispensing the word of TRUTH! Here is a minister of Christ, yes, reader, one who calls himself a minister of Christ, formerly a midshipman in his majesty's navy, "desirous of collecting his brother seamen within the sound of the glorious gospel!"—but he cannot do it. What! a minister of Christ, and not able to preach to his brother seamen the gospel? No reader, he cannot! But why? He has not a BETHEL FLAG, and poor perishing souls cannot receive the gospel, nor be cheered with the sound of the glorious gospel, without this Bethel Flag. Thus, reader, precious and immortal souls on the verge of eternity, may die and sink into eternal ruin while waiting for the Bethel Flag, which alone can authorize the minister of Christ to collect his brethren to hear the glorious gospel.

Reader, pause one moment, and reflect on what you have read in your Bible. Is there any thing

said in the Scriptures about a Bethel Flag? Did the Saviour direct his ministers to carry a flag with them, and without which they were not authorized to preach the glorious gospel? No such thing. Who compose this Bethel Society, and by what authority do they prescribe the manner in which the gospel shall be preached? Do they derive their authority from the Bible? If so, let some of its friends show us the passage which declares that the Bethel Flag must be hoisted, before the gospel can be preached. It may be said that this flag is only designed as a signal to inform sailors that religious services, particularly for them, are attended at such a place. Suppose we grant the propriety, nay, even the necessity of the signal for collecting seamen together, is it necessary that there should be a flag of a certain description for this purpose, a flag different from those used by the nations of the earth? But allowing even this to be the case, could not this holy minister who was anxious to collect his brethren together, have used a flag to be made according to the proper pattern, without sending, perhaps, two or three hundred miles, for a flag? Or has this Bethel Society assumed the authority of dictating who shall preach to seamen, and give this flag as a kind of license to collect them together, and that without this flag the glorious gospel shall not be preached to sailors? Is there not much of sectarianism in this; and is it to be the case that a man is not to be allowed to preach to seamen, unless he is thus authorized by this self-created society? Are not American sailors to hear the gospel preached until we can send to England for a Bethel Flag? We may soon expect to hear of flags adopted by missionary societies, Bible societies, nay, soon each sect will have its own appropriate flag, and we be to him, who preaches without this insignia of his authority, proudly waving on the spire of his meeting-house.

We have often heard loud lamentations and mourning on account of the perishing state of immortal souls, for want of a competent and learned ministry, but never till now did we learn, that notwithstanding a learned and competent minister was at hand, souls are to be suffered to perish eternally, for want of a **BETHEL FLAG** to authorize that minister to preach the glorious gospel of Christ. *Rel. Inq.*

From the National Advocate.

COSTLY CHURCHES.

In some late Philadelphia papers we read the description of several splendid churches which have been built, and some which are now completing. These descriptions occupied a considerable space in the newspaper. We had turrets, modern Gothic architraves, pillars with Ionic caps and bases, pulpits and pews of rich satin wood and mahogany, brilliant lustres and candelabras, communion table with a gorgeous display of massy plate, pews selling for \$50,000, church building \$100,000, minister's salary \$5000 and perquisites, and all ostentation, wealth and vanity.

When that bold and chivalrous minister, Paul, preached to the Athenians, he collected the people

around him on the areopagus and beneath the arch of heaven, and from a rock he denounced paganism and maintained the majesty of the "unknown God." When a yet greater preacher lectured the multitude, he did it in a manner equally simple and divested of ostentation.

How are the times changed! Can we worship God with so humble and contrite heart, when the eye is dazzled with the splendour of wealth and the glare of luxury and beauty? Can that heart be divested of all worldly considerations, and commune piously with our Creator amidst the rustling of silk, the blaze of light, and the tinsel and drapery of fashion? True, it may be said, that the temple of Solomon was unrivalled in splendour, but it was by the express command of God; it was the first temple dedicated to his worship, it was raised after the most costly edifices had been already erected to heathen deities, and it was due to the Sovereign Architect of the universe, that his temple should be without a parallel or comparison. But since the ferocity of conflicting nations has laid waste that splendid edifice, since the sacrifices have been superseded by other peace and free-will offerings, since the temples and altars of heathens have been prostrated, since worshippers of the true God have increased like the sands of the desert, it has been considered unnecessary to load the churches with ornaments, or to lavish those means for useless parade, which should be devoted to acts of charity, more acceptable to the Divinity than all this tinselled finery.

Religion now is becoming a fashion and not a duty; going to church, not to return our grateful thanks to the Father of Mercies, but to see and be seen.

Some Sabbaths ago, a tall thin dandy, with a tight neckcloth, and a head of huge bushy frizzled hair, after surveying me from head to foot with a small quizzing glass, drawled out, "Pray, sir, can you tell me which is the *fashionable* church?" "What sect do you mean, sir?" says I. "I'm not particular," said he, "so that it is a fashionable church, a young preacher, and a number of pretty girls there." This automaton was not singular. He strolled in at dinner, and drawing off his white gloves, throwing down his hat and a moss rose on the table, took his seat. "Well, sir," said I, "have you been edified with the sermon, and have you prayed devoutly?" "O yes, I've been much entertained," said he; "splendid church; so elegant; so many fashionable people there; ladies dressed so fine. I had a richly bound Prayer Book; the organ was delightful." "But the text," said I, "what was it?" "'Pon my soul can't say; very clever discourse; only thirty minutes; never yawned once; fine young preacher."

This is going to church among fashionables. There should be nothing of ornament or attraction in a church, beyond the sacred purposes for which it was erected. If these have no attractions, no fictitious objects should be raised to sway the inclination.

Contrast these costly buildings with the simple

village church; compare the young and fashionable preacher, with his \$5000 per ann. with the country curate,

"Passing rich with forty pounds a year,"

and show us the difference; tell us whether the emanations of a humble and pious heart, are not as acceptable at the Throne of Grace, when ascending from the altar of a village church, as from the marble aisles of a costly and splendid building?

When viewing the interior of one of these rich churches, we have often thought, that if some of the sick, lame, and blind, similar to those cured by Christ, were to enter during service, they would find no more attention shown them, than was exhibited to poor Lazarus, who found the way to Abraham's bosom without that charity which should have been extended to him. "*All men are equal*," if not in sight of man, certainly in the estimation of God.

MISSIONARY SPINNING WHEEL!

It is announced in the Connecticut Courant, that "a wheel and open room are kept at the house of Mr. George White, Church-street, for the use of those ladies who may wish to contribute to the small streams that compose the broad river of Missionary support." The writer of the article adds, that happening to call at a certain house between the hours of nine and ten in the evening, he found the mistress of the house, in the 84th year of her age, spinning in aid of the same cause. *D. Adver.*

REMARKS.

After seeing the above, who would be surprised to hear of a Missionary *saw and buck*, to enable the pious folks to *saw wood* in aid of the good cause! Indeed, on the whole, it is a good idea, and we tender it to the Missionary gentlemen gratuitously, as a donation, &c. If *spinning wheels*, and *saws and bucks*, are not resorted to, the cause must go down. When even the *pretended* firm supporters of the cause, who have it most at heart, *refuse*, in plain English, to pay *their* subscriptions to support it, as the celebrated, the Rev. Mr. F——, has done, *refusing* to pay *his* subscription to the Missionary Society, the prospect looks gloomy. This is not all. The Managers of the Missionary concern, are practising *deception*, and keeping back information, only showing the bright side of the picture. Let the public, for once, view the whole ground, and the farce will end. The cause is now *very sick*. Its writhings bespeak something more than a morbid affection. If sudden relief is not procured, this *Monster* of modern generation will expire, and the mourners drop into their original insignificance. There we wish them to be.

Query. Would it not look better, if young clerical dandies were seen *sawing wood early in the morning*, instead of old women of *eighty-four* years of age, spinning *'late at night'*? How gracefully will some spruce dandy, fresh from a Theological mill, pull off his *black silk gloves*, to receive the money obtained for the old lady's yarn!

There are about *sixty* clergymen in this city who are sticklers for the cause of Missions. We recommend to the ladies of their societies, without delay,

to furnish each of them with a *saw and buck*, and a tow cloth apron, (we suppose they do not understand *spinning* yarn,) that they may give evidence of their sincerity, and with *their* fingers assist in moving the burden they impose upon others. If they will do this, or something equivalent, they shall have credit for their sincerity. If they refuse, we pronounce them *hypocrites*!

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

FALSE STATEMENTS FROM THE DESK, and through the Press, (not) by the Rev. (that title belongs only to God,) William Roy.

Reader, please to look at my statement in No. 7 of the Gospel Herald, page 52, signed D. J., and then cast your eye on Wm. Roy's, No. 12, page 94, and what follows, judge ye. Before I published the piece in No. 7, I had a conversation with W. R. in Newark, (N. J.) when he came out of the Court-House, and afterwards also, in the city of New-York. I told him I should publish his strange assertions, when W. R. then hinted that I had better not, as we were both old countrymen. What a powerful argument why I ought not to make his assertions public! Reader, my only motive for publishing the same, was to check such impious and false assertions, that men should not look at the Bible with contempt, and thereby become modern Deists.

W. R. headed his reply, "*False Statements and Wilful Misrepresentations*," &c. God forbid that I should, in return, charge W. R. with *wilful* misrepresentations. But what part of my statement has W. R. disproved? I did not state, as he would wish the reader to understand, that Jesus Christ was the prodigal that had hired himself to the devil. But, that W. R. stated of the *prodigal sinner* that hired himself to W. R.'s *citizen* of this world, the *Devil*, that he the Devil, had no right to hold the prodigal *sinner* in slavery; because the prodigal *sinner* was the son of God, and must return to his Father's house. Here I would ask of friend Roy his experience. Have not you been a prodigal? and where? and are not you a son of God? or did God become your Father when you sought him?

Second Objection. "He did not say, that if the people gave only \$1 to the support of the poor," &c. Neither have I so said. I have published your *own* words, "Look at the prodigals up above," &c. and for the gift of \$1, what doth he promise? Ans. *Eternal life*! Not caring what was their creed or morals, if he could draw out the money.

Third Objection. "He did not say, that to his *certain* knowledge there were twenty minister in New-York," &c. But W. R. has lowered his note, and through the press, says, that he had "known *nearly* that number since he resided there."

Fourth Objection. "He did not say, that Universalists were worse than Atheists or Deists. We presume that if either of the latter had heard the discourse alluded to, they would have had more *candour* than to misrepresent what they could not comprehend." I ask, What *candour* could W. R. have expected from Atheists and Deists, had they been present and heard him shut them out from the

privilege of entering any church? As to their, or my comprehending his absurd discourse, it is all out of the question. For verily, I believe that W. R. neither comprehended nor could prove his own words.

We shall now look for a moment at the weight which those nine witnesses give to exonerate W. R. from the charges I have brought against him. First, Mr. L. Sythoff. This gentleman is no colonel nor ever was. But we suppose *Coll* was added to give respectability to his signature. This gentleman is a respectable man. But I am under the necessity of saying, that this same gentleman, in my presence, accused him of the same gross assertions. And previous to this, went into Mr. Reynold's, (Sheriff's room) and there, to the sheriff, accused W. R. and said that W. R. ought not to be permitted to enter any pulpit. Since he signed his name to W. R.'s list of witnesses, he told the sheriff and others, that he was drawn into it in a hurry, and expressed his regret at signing it. This the sheriff desired me to say, and use his name, &c. 2d witness, J. C. Ogden. This gentleman has had one or more paralytic strokes, and his memory is much impaired thereby; and on that account, those who know him, could not rely on his testimony. 3d witness, W. H. Hyatt. This gentleman has been very active in getting persons to sign W. R.'s paper; and Mr. H. told me, that he sent it to W. R. and asked me if I had seen his letter to W. R., and said, that he had therein stated to W. R. that he was in his discourse very sensorious, &c.; and Mr. H. stated, that the paper he signed, read differently from that W. R. had published, and that he, Mr. H., added the last part of W. R.'s third objection—"He might have known some of those in different places, where he has been since he came to that city." This we think was a friendly addition by Mr. H., to reduce the round number of friend Roy's 20 ministers in New-York. 4th witness, Zenas Connet, has declared to Mr. S. H. Pierson, that he was sorry he had signed W. R.'s paper. I have not time to write of each witness particularly, but briefly state, that Mr. G. Rhoda bears a very good name, and the people of Newark that heard the discourse, are astonished that he should have signed his name to W. R.'s list. As to the remainder of the witnesses, I will be charitably silent.

I here subjoin the testimony of *three* as respectable persons as probably can be found in Newark. As to the correctness of my statement, in No. 7, Stephen H. Pierson, a member of Mr. Richards' church, stated to me, that a love of the truth constrained him to offer me a few lines under his hand. Samuel H. Congar, a member of Mr. Hays' church, and Richard Prosser, a gentleman of veracity, have also offered me their evidence, which you will read below. And I would advise friend W. R. and whom it may concern, to call on these gentlemen and the Sheriff, for further proof, as to the truth of my declarations. I could have had more names as my witnesses, but consider these three gentlemen abundantly sufficient!

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN—Mr. J. Ditchett called on me with a statement of some doctrines preached on the 15th of June last, at the Court House in this place, by a gentleman of the Methodist connexion; and also an answer, signed by several who heard the discourse, denying the same to be true. By request of Mr. Ditchett, as he considers his character brought in question, I am constrained to say, that I heard the discourse, and was sorry to hear, as well as now to say, that the statement made by Mr. Ditchett, and published in the Gospel Herald of the 28th June last, is correct. **STEPHEN H. PIERSON.**

Newark, July 31, 1823.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: We, being called upon by Mr. Ditchett with a statement of some doctrines preached in the Court House, in this place, by a minister of the Methodist connexion, on the 15 June last, and also an

answer, attempting to prove his statement incorrect. By request of Mr. Ditchett, who considers his character brought in question, we are compelled to state, from the best of our recollection, that the statement of Mr. Ditchett is correct.

RICHARD PROSSER.
SAMUEL H. CONGAR.

Newark, July 31, 1823.

Now I, John Ditchett, further say, that it devolves on W. R., as he has not even attempted to disprove the most prominent and objectionable assertions I have made, to prove by reason and scripture his own words.

1st. "When man was created, he was superior to angels. 2d. After the fall of man, the earth was the estate or property of the Devil. 3d. That the Devil was the citizen of this world, &c. 4th. That an independent spirit was the first step to prodigality. 5th. That the kiss denoted that God was reconciled to the returning prodigal. (Was he not always reconciled, or doth God change as poor man does?) 6th. That Christ was the *fatted calf*, slain at the return of the sinner. 7th. That Universalists, &c. &c. ought not to be admitted into any church. 8th. That 20 ministers in New-York, to his certain knowledge, had turned from their former faith. 9th. That one minister in New-York had cut his throat. (Not one that had been a minister. For if I should say the President had cut his throat, and name Thomas Jefferson, it would be an untruth.) 10th. That W. R. has the privilege of securing, and the authority to promise, eternal life to a man for only giving one dollar to the prodigals up stairs, in the Court-house at Newark, New-Jersey.

N. B. I would inform the readers of the Gospel Herald, that the Editor, in his remarks on W. R.'s statement, says, D. J., because my communications to him are signed with my initials reversed. In my last piece, I modestly charged W. R. with saying so and so. But W. R. in his reply to me, says, *John Ditchett*, in full; and he in that reply also says, "For with what measure ye mete, says our Lord, it shall be measured to you again." I therefore return Mr. W. Roy, that measure he meted out to me, by exposing his name in full.

P. S. William Roy states, he has resided in N. York thirteen years. Permit me to ask, Were not you a clerk in Albany, within these eight years?

I now leave William Roy in Christian love, praying that God our heavenly Father, may bless him with a true knowledge of his nature and character, and of his own ignorance. And I would recommend to him to be more acquainted with the Bible, before he goes abroad to instruct his fellow sinners in the word of truth and life. **D. J.**

Note—Since writing the above, I have received a letter from Mr. Stephen H. Pierson, from which I extract the following—

"Newark, Aug. 4, 1823.
"Dear Sir—I have thought proper to write a few lines to you. Mr. S. H. Congar tells me, that he has had a conversation with George Rhoda. Mr. Rhoda does not seem inclined to contradict himself; but he will not undertake to say what Mr. Roy did NOT say. He says, he only took notice of the GOOD part of his discourse. (He could not then have taken notice of what you noted down). That he did not consider it of much importance when he signed it, not taking notice enough to see that any one's character would be injured by it."

It is proper to say, that Mr. Rhoda is considered to be a man of veracity, who would not wilfully give a wrong statement. And that it appears he acted from the impulse of the moment, to silence the importunity of the applicant, without considering the subject to possess, perhaps, ordinary importance.

D. J.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 16, 1823.

NO. 14.

REVIEW

Of a book, entitled "AN APPEAL to the citizens of New-York, in behalf of the Christian Sabbath. By GARDINER SPRING, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church. New-York: Printed by J. SEYMOUR, 49 John-street; 1823. 8vo. pp. 28.

If the Rev. Dr. Spring has been pre-eminently celebrated in particulars, we think his *honest pretensions*, often told, will appear about the first in the catalogue. We are disposed to grant this gentleman a niche in the temple of fame, surmounted with a garland of his own wreathing. It would be uncharitable not to allow him the undisturbed possession of his virtues of every kind; and malice could not do worse than accuse him of superfluous aberrations. We are willing to believe he has a motive for every action; and a passion at the head of every impulse. That reasons, which appear weighty to his mind, influence his decisions, and spur him to mount the stage of public animadversion. The theatre of his present exploits is already distinguished by his former unsuccessful efforts; and the present attempt may, peradventure, heal the wounds received in an old engagement, if it fail of obtaining a present victory! Thus much for a civil and respectful exordium, and we proceed to notice his book.

If in our remarks we should be so unfortunate as to incur the reverend gentleman's displeasure, we shall have the only solace of an upright motive. The only pretension we avow, is, a hearty and continual desire, to see the *professed* disciples of Christ, *practise* his virtues! To see the downfall of *clerical pride and arrogance*, and the substitution of *sincerity and humility*. In a word, to see that era arrive, when clergymen shall be as disinterested in their conduct, as they now are in their *professions*! Doctor Spring's commencement is a well written avowal of his motives. He disclaims all intention and desire of coercion. He would "exercise no authority;"—O no! He only aspires "to the influence which one man exerts over another, by considerations addressed to his *understanding*," &c. This is very good. Pity 'tis not sincere! How unfortunate it is, that this *mild good man*, should so forget his natural complacency, for which he is so justly distinguished, as to declare in his 22d page, that "there is a *thought* [an *unlucky* obtrusive thought,] which it was my purpose to submit to your consideration before I close. It is this." What? Why only this—"Does not the importance of the Sabbath, in a civil view, invest it with an undeniable claim to the protection of public *LAW*?" This is all. How smooth!

How nice! How clever! Doctor Spring, let certain folks say what they please about him, is certainly a *very excellent man*. This must be true. We have the best authority for it: His *own* testimony! Doctor Spring, pious, humble, tender, kind, good man, if the *sword* were put into his hand, would convert it into a *ploughshare* in a moment! What! Use *coercion*? O, no! Compel people? Never! Merely address considerations to the *understanding* of mankind, and if they will not give heed to our affectionate solicitations, how we shall pity them!

Gracious God! What considerations were addressed to the understanding of *SERVETUS*, when Calvin's "*public law*" encircled his body with burning fagots, and sent his agonized soul, in *flames*, to heaven? Alas! alas! alas! for human pretensions. Will the smile of an assassin blunt the point of his dagger? No! Neither will clerical pretensions disarm hypocrisy of deception, or deceit of its guile. Gild the poisonous pill with flattery,—administer it in a cup brilliant with precious gems, the destruction of the wretched recipient of your *bounty* is inevitable. Sir, your pretensions are rotten. The scale of your excellence, and the balance of your integrity hang awry. On what principle would you recommend *coercion* to others, if it would be wrong in *yourself*? When did Jesus Christ, your only legitimate authority and pattern, appeal to the secular power, and beg the use of its *sword* to *protect* his laws or ordinances? Sir, your memory will be paralyzed with a single effort, to find a precedent to sanction your abominable scheme, unless you rummage the archives of superstition, and resort to the bloody annals of Devils! If the modern sabbath is a *civil* institution, the secular arm should be raised for its support; not hypocritically on pretence. If it is an appointment of God, as its reverend advocate contends, human laws are unnecessary.

Dr. Spring appeals to the *patriotism* of the public. We make the same appeal. If there is any feature pre-eminently excellent in the Constitution of the United States, it is found in the *toleration of religious sentiments*. It speaks, with a varied phraseology, the sentiments of Paul, (*Christ's apostle*,) Col. ii. 16, 17, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath *days*: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body *is* of Christ." We reiterate these sentiments. Reader, are you a *patriot*? Conduct like one. Never lift a finger to *coerce* your neighbour, and compel him to believe, or think, or act differently in religion from his own judgment. Heaven in mercy

preserve our beloved country from the worst of tyranny, *clerical oppression*! It appears that Dr. S. is not satisfied with the privilege of observing the *first*, and every day of the week, as *he pleases*, but would deprive others of the same liberty. If this is patriotism, it is the patriotism of a *modern priest*! Not of a *free layman*! We are disgusted with the hypocrisy of this timeserving Appeal. If the reverend gentleman effects any thing more by this effort of his genius, than a more perfect development of his hypocritical pretensions, we shall be mistaken.

In p. 4, Dr. S. asserts, that "Ever since the creation of the world, the *great mass of mankind* have united in the observance of every *seventh* day, as a day of religious worship." If this were admitted, then Dr. S. must admit, that "ever since the creation of the world, the *great mass of mankind*" have been idolaters, and *ignorant* of the character and perfections of God! Dr. S. therefore has for evidence the conduct of ignorant idolaters. He is welcome to it. In p. 5, Dr. S. considers there is "*presumptive* testimony that the consecration of every seventh day was the object of divine appointment, and the celebration of it the matter of a traditional revelation from the family of Noah." Here then, is a precious confession. "*Presumptive* testimony." Dr. S. also says, in p. 5. "The formal designation of *this* day [here the Dr. *begs the question*!], as a day of rest by God himself, immediately after the creation, is a consideration of *some force* in this investigation." How much force, Doctor? We will tell you reader, turning the leaf, we find, on p. 6, that Dr. S. declares *positively* of this day, "that it was not, as has been asserted, a mere Mosaic rite, but an institution of earlier date, committed to our *first parents*, as the *representatives of their whole posterity*, and unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, extending its binding force, not only through the Patriarchal and Jewish, but Christian dispensations." We never saw a more miserable *begging of the question*, than this. First acknowledging that the evidence is "*presumptive testimony*"—then "*of some force*," and all at once muster courage, and considering the whole proved, declare positively. This may do very well for Dr. Spring, but a boy of fourteen years, who should presume to palm such trash upon his tutors, for logical deductions, would get his *ears boxed*.

It is pitiful for a man of Dr. Spring's years, advantages, and pretensions, to be the acknowledged progenitor of such a *wretched issue*! How long, Sir, has your *ipse dixit* been a legal currency? And where did you acquire the effrontery, to palm upon the public, for *fact*, your unsupported assertion? Pray, Sir, where did you learn, or who told you, that the Jewish Sabbath was "*committed to our first parents*?" And that this was done, considering them as "*the representatives of their whole posterity*?" We have nothing but *your word* for this. And we are authorized by the use you have made of it, in your book, to say, that it is not the best authority!

After all the labours of this would-be great man, the whole matter rests where Paul left it. The Jewish Sabbath was an ordinance binding on the

Jews only. If a Gentile abode in a Jewish city on the Sabbath, he was obliged to conform to their regulations. Now we can give Dr. S. something more than "*presumptive testimony*." Christ has informed us, of all the moral law, and said not a word about observing the Jewish or any other Sabbath. Look at it—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart," &c. "and thy neighbour as thyself." The following testimony, "from men who have *hazarded their lives* for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," we think is sufficient. We entreat the reader to ponder it well. He will find that in the days of the apostles there were men, who, like Doctor Spring, wanted to lord it over God's heritage.

Acts xv. 19-29, "Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and *from* fornication, and *from* things strangled, and *from* blood. For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day. Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: and they wrote *letters* by them after this manner, The apostles, and elders, and brethren, *send* greeting unto the brethren, which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying *Ye must* be circumcised, and keep the law, to whom we gave no *such* commandment: it seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul; men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell *you* the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: *that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.*"

The above testimony cannot be correct, if Dr. S. is correct. Shall we give the preference to Dr. S., who never hazarded any thing but his *salary*, and is very careful of that, over the disciples and apostles of Christ? No! Although farther notice of this appeal is unnecessary, to prove its absurdity, we shall not dismiss it without noticing some of Dr. S.'s sayings.

Dr. S. says in p. 26, "Who has authorized any man, or set of men, to trample on a divine institution, for the sake of his *own convenience*?" In p. 8, Dr. S. says, of the Sabbath, "Whether it be the *first or last* day of the week, I cannot consider *essential* to the institution." Ah! But what is the divine institution? Ans. "The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, *in it thou shalt not*," &c. Now we think this is very plain!

In p. 13, Dr. S. asserts roundly, "*No villain regards the Sabbath.*" Reader, we appeal to the inhabitants of this great city, for the truth of the declaration, that some of the *greatest villains* this city has been burdened with, have been *long-faced gentlemen*, sticklers for *clergymen's rights*, very *pious* in their speeches, and very *great observers of the Sabbath!!!* We make this declaration boldly, and are ready to support it, if necessary, with something better than "*presumptive testimony*," and "*considerations of some force!*" We say the Jewish Sabbath, was a *type* of the Christian's rest under the Gospel dispensation. To the Christian, *every day* is a Sabbath. *Praying* on Sunday, and *cheating* on Monday, is poor business. Dr. S. adds—"The Sabbath is a barrier which must be broken down, before men can become giants in iniquity." We deny it. Facts of recent date declare, that men have gone from the church and communion table, to the State Prison. More than this. Facts will prove, that professed *Deists*, in this city, have conducted in a manner that satirises the long-faced pretender. Dr. S.'s declarations are deserving of no better name, than *frothy hyperbole!*

In p. 14, Dr. S. says, "I should like to see an authentic and correct history of all the prisons in the land; and unless I am much deceived, such a statement would not present an instance of an individual who had not broke over the restraints of the Sabbath before he was abandoned to crime," &c. We tell Dr. S. it is unnecessary to go out of your own city, to prove you very "much deceived."

In p. 16, Dr. S. says, "Nor is the influence of the Sabbath to be disregarded as it respects the *means of a comfortable subsistence.*" This is certainly appropos. This is logical. There is nothing like facts, and the Doctor now speaks from *experience!* Including the salary and perquisites, every Sabbath Doctor Spring regards, brings him the "*comfortable*" sum of seventy-seven dollars, wanting a fraction. We must confess, for once, Dr. S. reasons like a Philosopher.

We have a fellow feeling for Doctor S., although there is some shade of difference in our religious opinions, and cannot help sympathizing with him in the mortifications he must endure, on account of the misfortune he has so long laboured under of contradicting himself, in a most terrible manner. In p. 19, Dr. S. declares, "*The Sabbath is THE GREAT MEANS OF HOLINESS AND ETERNAL LIFE.*" But, in his Sermon on Election, (a very famous production!) he will have it, that the *decree of election* is "the great means," &c. for he there declares, "If they are not *elect*ed they will indeed perish." We do not like this blowing hot and cold with the same breath. The Doctor appears to be enraptured with his new ideas, and in p. 20, declares of the saved, that "With one voice must they ascribe this inestimable inheritance to the influence of the Sabbath." And then he runs at random, bewildered in a fog of his own raising. It is a great pity that the Bible, that precious old Book, is not so good authority, in the opinion of many pious folks, as the declarations of the Rev. Gardiner

Spring. The good old Bible informs us, that the saved ascribe their salvation to Christ, &c. Dr. S. adds, "Blot out the Sabbath, and you blot out the last beam of hope from the troubled and desponding heart." Stop Doctor. Where is your decree of election, which in your Sermon was to effect all?

In p. 22, Dr. S. makes a declaration unrivalled for its absurdity. We question whether a sane adult can be found, who will give Dr. S. credit for telling the truth. Here it is—"Rather would I *yield my immortality*, than hear the knell that tolls the departure of this Great Day." We do not believe the Doctor, for the following reasons, which we shall exhibit in the shape of interrogations, &c. How can you be sincere, when you ascribe the salvation of man to the Sabbath, in your 21st page, and declare, on other occasions, that the salvation of man is secured by God's *decree* of election? And declaring, as you have done, "If they are *not elect*ed, they will indeed perish," How can you promise salvation, as you have done, p. 23, on condition of setting apart the Sabbath? Pray, Sir, how long have you possessed this extraordinary zeal for the Sabbath, and what first produced it? We ask you seriously, Was not the *promise of a "comfortable subsistence,"* and the prospect of future honour and *money*, the all-prevailing motive with you, to enlist in your present vocation? Did you experience any radical change in your affections and views, before you were promised "the *comfortable subsistence?*" Would not you have continued in your secular calling, had not the present been urged as one more lucrative and honourable, and the earnest of the profit made about certain at the onset? Was not your change of profession produced, *altogether*, by motives of a pecuniary kind, and your subsequent *professions*, a matter of course, rather than of principle? If you answer in the negative, will you not admit, that a very singular and remarkable coincidence attended your induction to the observance of the Sabbath? And will you not also admit, that now, for one so holy, so much in love with the Sabbath, and so profuse in expressions of concern for the souls of men, there exists a most unaccountable love of *money*, sufficient to authorize a charitable conjecture, at least, that money first produced a change in your calling, and continues to influence your present conduct! Had you, Sir, like the apostles of Christ, "*hazarded your life*, for the name of Jesus," or even hazarded any thing, and proved by sacrifices and deprivations, *voluntarily* endured, your sincerity, whatever your doctrine might have been, you would be entitled, at least, to respect. But, now, what are the pretensions of the man, thus obtruding himself upon the public, and vociferating his zeal for the Sabbath? We answer—They are those of a *hireling!*

Conclusion—We have used great plainness of speech. If we are wrong, may Heaven in mercy counteract the evil: If we are right, may the arm of Omnipotence accompany the truth, and render its energies irresistible, to the destruction of clerical pride and oppression.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—A short time past a friend of mine entered into conversation with the Rev. Mr. Cox, of the Presbyterian Church in Spring-street, upon the subject of religion. Mr. Cox soon discovered that he had a leaning towards Universalism, and went to work with all his might, to eradicate that most pernicious (in his opinion) of all heresies. Among other things, he told my friend that he was apprehensive Universalism would become the prevailing sentiment in New-York; and that it was that spirit that led to the *robbery of the mail*, almost immediately after the President had granted pardon to two of these villains. My friend inquired of his Reverence, why he did not publicly meet the Universalists in debate, as he had sufficient opportunity to do so, either in the columns of the Herald, or in their Society held for the purpose of investigation? assuring him, that if he did he would be treated as a gentleman ought. Mr. Cox answered, he was not afraid to meet and debate with any Universalist in any way, but that he was apprehensive, if he should, he would meet with treatment from them similar to that experienced by a friend of his, a clergyman, who accepted of a challenge from Hosea Ballou, and who, after effectually confuting and confounding Mr. Ballou, was hissed at by the Universalists. Mr. Cox also told my friend, that they, Universalists, hissed the Methodists, when they appeared in their Society in New-York, to argue with them.

Now, Mr. Fitz, I am of opinion, that Mr. Cox ought to be publicly called upon for his *evidences* of the truth of these assertions. If he is in possession of any, he certainly can have no objection to produce them.

A sense of duty obliges me to send you this communication, with my request that you will give it a place in the Herald, accompanied with your remarks. I remain yours sincerely.

JOHN DOUGLASS.

New-York, Aug. 8th, 1823.

REMARKS.

We have no hesitation in declaring the Rev. Mr. Cox's assertions to be destitute of *all truth*. We offer him the columns of this paper to prove his assertions, or to confess his mistake. If this gentleman neglects or refuses to notice this, we hope the public will decide, whether Mr. Cox has *no regard for the truth*, or whether he has a license to *slander* Universalists with impunity. If the latter be the case, on information duly made, we shall acknowledge it.

To our brethren of this despised faith, we offer a word of consolation. Brethren, this is the gentleman who saddled the *yellow fever* upon you, last summer! You now, it seems, are some way connected with the *robbery of the mail*. These would be serious allegations, were they true. But, you must recollect, they originated in the disturbed brain of a Hopkinsian clergyman. Perhaps, "*he does not mean as he says*," which was the case with Dr. Spring, (of the same faith,) who committed himself not long since, and backed out with becoming gravity. There is another consideration. Their peculiar

phraseology. Dr. Hopkins says, "Adam was not the *cause*, but the *occasion* of the sin of his posterity." The Rev. Mr. Cox may only mean, that you "are not the *cause*, but the *occasion*," of the evils complained of. And when the Rev. Mr. Cox tells a *hard story*, "he is not the *cause*, but the *occasion* of it!" With some such helps as these, we think the Rev. Mr. Cox can work along tolerably smooth.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—A few days since I took up a book called the "*Portraiture of Methodism*," when the following passages attracted my attention.

In a pamphlet written by Mr. Wesley, and entitled "*Serious thoughts upon the Perseverance of the Saints*," are the following observations:

"1. By the Saints, I understand those who are holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself; those who are endued with the faith which purifies the heart and produces a good conscience; those who are grafted into the good olive tree, the Spiritual, invisible church; those who are branches of the true vine, of whom Christ says, "I am the vine, ye are the branches;" those who so effectually know Christ as by that knowledge to have escaped the pollutions of the world; those who see the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, and who have been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, of the witness and fruits of the Spirit; those who live by faith in the Son of God; those who are sanctified by the blood of the covenant; those to whom all or any of these characters belong, I mean by the term Saints: But

1. "Can any of these fall away? *By falling away* we mean not barely falling into sin. This it is granted they may. But can they fall *totally*? Can any of these so fall from God, as to perish everlastingly. Either side of this question is attended with great difficulties; such as reason alone would never remove. But to the law and to the testimony. On this authority, I believe a saint may fall away; that one who is holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself, may nevertheless so fall from God, as to perish everlastingly. "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, in his trespasses that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die," Ezek. xviii. 24. That this is to be understood of *eternal* death, appears from the 26th verse—"When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, (here is a *temporal* death) for the iniquity he hath done *he shall die*." (Here is death *eternal*.) It appears farther, from the whole scope of the chapter which is to prove, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." If you say that the soul here means the body, I answer, that will die whether you sin or not." &c. &c.

Any remarks which you may make, Mr. Editor, on the foregoing, particularly on that quotation, of "The soul that sinneth it shall die," will be read with pleasure by

Yours, &c. L.M.

N. B. The character of a saint, given in the first

part, differs very much from the one given by the *Rev. Hooper Cumming*.

REMARKS.

It is a lamentable fact, that men who have been extolled for their wisdom, and almost idolized, have sometimes expressed the greatest absurdities, and very gravely made declarations puerile to the last extreme. Such is Mr. Wesley's assertion of the definition of Ezek. xviii. 26. Now, what is passing strange, is, Mr. Wesley, in his remark on the 4th verse, would have his readers to understand, that both of his supposed deaths, in verse 26, are *eternal* deaths! "The body will die, whether you sin or not." Well, so be it. But the *death* spoken of in the 26th verse, is a death in consequence of *sin*. Mr. W.'s construction is a wretched one. There is nothing more nor less declared than this—When a *righteous man* turneth away from his righteousness, he shall die because he turneth away, &c. First, is declared the fact—Second, the cause of it. It is a simple statement, that a man dies for his *own* sin, in contradiction to the allegations of the Israelites, against God, that 'the *fathers* have eaten sour grapes, and the *children's* teeth are set on edge.' This was a proverb among the Jews, certifying that they suffered for their *father's* sins. It is abominable to pervert God's declarations in the manner Mr. W. has done. God declares only this—that when a righteous man turns from his righteousness, and dies, that he dies for *his* sins, or his *iniquity* that *he* hath done; and not on account of his progenitor's sins.

We must understand that the Jews were very ignorant of God's ways. From the connexion, it appears that temporal death was all the Jews considered. The declaration in verse 4, "The *soul* that sinneth it shall die," is explained by the following verse, "If a *man* be just," &c. The word *soul* used as a convertible term with *man*. There are two deaths, spoken of in Scripture, which we are to understand to be, what is called, *temporal*, the death of the *body*, and *spiritual*, which is to become carnally minded. But nowhere do we read of an *eternal* death. Strictly speaking, the Scriptures speak of no death but temporal death. For death itself is temporal, and shall be destroyed.

Mr. Wesley's definition of a saint, that he is one "Who is righteous in the judgment of God himself," brings to our recollection a declaration of Mr. W., which he made from the pulpit, a short time before he died—that "he never did so well as he could, for one half hour in his life." When God looked down upon the children of men, and there was none righteous, no, not one, there was none living, according to Arminianism, who would be saved. We rejoice that the Lord reigneth, and that the world shall be established that it shall not be removed. God will judge the people righteously.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

Our good friend, Samuel Woodworth Esq. Editor of the "New-Jerusalem Missionary," published in this city, in his Number for the last month, (July) takes a very respectful notice of some of our re-

marks on Mr. Boswell's "Address to the Baptist Church of Trenton and Lamberton." (See No. 8, p. 57.) The following is Mr. Woodworth's extracts, reply, &c.

"Mr. Boswell has left the cruel hypothesis of Calvin, and, we understand, adopted the sentiments of those who style themselves the 'New-Jerusalem Church.' This is something better; for in the stead of accusing the Creator of *making* his creatures miserable, this doctrine only teaches that he *permits* them to be miserable, and is too impotent, indifferent, or ignorant, to effect their holiness and happiness. Now, as indifference is the consequence of ignorance, not having that knowledge of things which is requisite to produce a corresponding estimate of their value, the deficiency may be considered to proceed from *impotence*, and *ignorance*. A being of this description would excite compassion. Whereas Calvin's Moloch must excite feelings of detestation, &c."

"In reply to this, we would ask Mr. Fitz if it is any evidence of the *impotence*, *indifference*, or *ignorance* of God that he *permits* any of his creatures to suffer pain in this world? If he answer in the negative, we would then inquire how he can more easily reconcile, to *his* ideas of a merciful God, a year, a month, a day, or even a moment's suffering, than an eternity? If the *permission* of endless misery be an evidence of the partiality, cruelty, or injustice of God, the *permission* of a moment's pain must be testimony of equal weight in *kind*, though not in *degree*, to prove the existence of the same *imperfections* in Deity. A *perfect* being must be perfect in the *least* particular, as well as in the *greatest*. We will, therefore, ask Mr. Fitz a few questions, which if he can answer, we promise to answer any questions which he may put to us.

"1st. Why does God *permit* any of his creatures to suffer pain or unhappiness in this world, when, by an exertion of his omnipotent power, he could, with infinite ease, (according to your doctrine,) render them all happy?"

"2d. Is that God perfect in mercy, who *can*, and yet *does not*, make his creatures *perpetually* happy, in *this* world, as well as in the *next*?"

"3d. Why does a merciful God permit innocent infants, lambs, doves, and other harmless animals, to suffer from disease, the cruelty of dogs, and still more inhuman man?"

Mr. Woodworth, although well acquainted with his own doctrines, and well qualified to defend them against greater errors, is, we think, almost altogether unacquainted with the Scripture doctrine, which we advocate, of the *unbounded*, *impartial*, and *unchangeable* goodness of God. If this were not the case, we think Mr. W. could not have committed himself as he has done, by making the above queries. Preparatory to our remarks, as a reply to Mr. W.'s queries, we urge the consideration of the following axioms, which Mr. W. *must* accede to; namely—"It is impossible for a thing (or principle) to *be*, and *not* to be at the same time." And we add, that every thing or principle which is immutable, is always, of necessity, *the same*.

Mr. W.'s first position is this: "If it is no evidence of the *impotence, indifference, or ignorance* of God, that he permits any of his creatures to *suffer* pain in *this* world, then it is no evidence of the *impotence, indifference, or ignorance* of God, should he permit his creatures to *suffer* to all *eternity*." And Mr. W. asks, "How we can more easily reconcile to our ideas of a merciful God, a year, a month, a day, or even a *moment's* suffering, than an *eternity*?"

To this we reply—We learn from the Scriptures, that God's chastisements are for man's *good*. Again. That God doth not *afflict willingly*. By which we understand, that God does not permit any suffering without a justifiable motive. His motive is, that man may be a partaker of his holiness. We are commanded to be *perfect*, "even as our Father, who is in heaven is perfect." And Mr. W. has wisely declared, that "a *perfect* being must be perfect in the *least* particular, as well as in the *greatest*." Now, we presume, Mr. W. will admit, that God's *greatest* perfection, in relation to man, consists in His advancing man to a *likeness* of Himself, that man may be *perfect* in His (God's) *holiness*. Therefore, even this perfection, so honourable to God, and so inestimable to man, is predicated on the fact, that God's perfections have regard to the *least* that can befall man, or in any way affect his well-being. This is in harmony with the Scriptures, which assure us, that so great is God's perfection, and his solicitude for his creatures, that nothing can befall them without his knowledge, and that He even takes cognizance of the fall of a *sparrow*! Now we advance the following position—Every thing done by God, is done in *love*. Every thing permitted by God, is permitted in *love*.

Mr. W. can now see, how we can more easily reconcile a year, &c. or a *moment's* suffering, with God's perfection, than an *eternity* of wretchedness. But, we ask Mr. W., if you cannot do this, how can you define or advocate the *perfection* of the character of the God you worship? Is he so *indifferent* toward his creatures, that it is all one with him, whether they suffer a year or interminably? Whether the suffering shall be productive of *good*, or evil? Or, is he so *ignorant*, that he is altogether unacquainted with the final event, and reposes in comfortable stupidity, until he is roused by some unlooked for contingency? Or, is he so impotent, that he cannot control events, and submits to a fatality greater than himself, and which rules the god, and tortures and destroys in blind and irremediable fury, the creatures of this imperfect maker? Now we declare, that to all the reason we possess, and to every mental power of perception and sense, nothing can be more apparent and certain, than this—that the *permission* or *infliction* of pain or *suffering*, for a moment, or for an eternity, if no good is *intended*, is an evidence of *cruelty*. And if no good is *produced*, of *impotence* also. It would be an insult to the reason of any man, to tell him that God would permit or inflict upon him endless *misery*, for his *happiness*!

We agree with Mr. W. that the *permission* of a

moment's suffering, without a justifiable motive, must be good evidence to prove the imperfection of the being who permits it, as much so, as an eternity of unavailing wretchedness could be. Now, what follows? Ans. If God permits any of his creatures to suffer endlessly, he is *imperfect*. If he permits them to suffer a moment, without regard to their well-being, he is *imperfect*. For, "A *perfect* being must be perfect in the *least* particular, as well as in the *greatest*." A contrary conclusion, would confound all ideas of right and wrong; of benevolence and cruelty; of mercy and malice; of God and the devil! We give a *reason* why the permission of *endless* suffering is an evidence of *cruelty* in God, because the sufferer is an *endless loser* by his existence, and can never receive any *benefit* or good from his suffering. We give Scripture, too, why *endless* misery is contrary to God. For *God says*, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit *should fail* before me, and the souls I have made. For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wroth, and smote him, I hid me, and was wroth, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart. I have seen his ways and *will heal him*; I will lead him also, and restore comforts unto him and to his mourners." Isa. lvii. 16—18. We give a reason, in the above quotation, why *limited* suffering is not an evidence of cruelty in God, because God will *bless the sufferer*, and "lead him, and heal him, and restore comforts unto him," &c.

Take an earthly father, and remember, that his perfection must be like his heavenly Father's perfection. Mr. W. is a father. Would it be an evidence of *cruelty* in you, to inflict, or to permit the suffering of your child, for ever, without regard to its welfare? If you chastise your child for a moment, for the child's *benefit*, is it an evidence that you are a *cruel* parent?

We now answer to Mr. W.'s interrogations, numbered 1, 2, 3, as follows—

"1st. Why does God *permit* any of his creatures to suffer pain or unhappiness in this world, when by an exertion of his omnipotent power, he could, with infinite ease, (according to your doctrine,) render them all happy?"

This interrogation is a sufficient evidence of Mr. W.'s ignorance of our doctrine. We answer, First. We have proved that God's purpose is man's good. In accordance with this gracious purpose man is brought into this mode of being; where he must be chastised, in accordance with God's good purpose. We read, Rom. viii. "The creature was made subject to *vanity* [a state where sin, and consequent suffering, has, so far, been unavoidable,] not *willingly*;" or without a justifiable and good motive. Not *gladly*, because God prefers the suffering of the creature. Even the man Christ Jesus, although without actual sin, suffered in his sympathy even for his enemies, before he suffered, physically, the death of the cross. Second. According to "*our doctrine*," man must exist, and suffer, as he does, before his glory can be perfected. "*Life is short*." So say all; on ordinary occasions. Shall we now deny our every day assertions, to prove God

unmerciful? No! This world, compared to another and a better, is but a *dream*. Paul counted the present suffering not worthy to be compared to the glory which should be revealed, &c. We, therefore, say, God now permits suffering, for a *short* time, for man's good.

"2d. Is that God perfect in mercy, who *can*, and yet *does not*, make his creatures *perpetually happy* in *this* world, as well as in the *next*?"

Ans. We will, first, ask a question. Is it not an evidence of the incapacity of a surgeon, that his patient does not experience so much *ease* while his *leg is sawing*, as after it is off, and the stump healed? God is making his creatures perfectly and perpetually happy. Will you be so kind as to grant a little time for the accomplishment of this glorious purpose? Distort nothing. Admit that God is *now* "good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." That man is tormenting himself, and his neighbour, and to find an excuse, would prove that God will do likewise. If Mr. W. had asked, "Is that God almighty in power, who does not make men as old at their birth as at their death?" it would appear quite as reasonable, as the question asked, when we consider God's character, man's destiny, and the glory that shall be revealed in man.

Now it stands thus—God is *perfect* in mercy. God does not make his creatures so happy in *this* life, as in a *future*. It is not, therefore, any evidence of a deficiency of mercy in God, that he permits his creatures to suffer in *this* life. The above position is founded on Scripture, reason, and nature, or facts. Reverse it—God is *imperfect* in mercy. God does make his creatures as happy in *this* life, as in a *future*. It is, therefore, an evidence of a deficiency of mercy in God, that he permits his creatures to suffer in *this* life. Now the common error is, that men, a large portion of them, will be *more miserable* in a future world, than they are or shall be in this. With the manner, mode, and precise quantity of misery, your doctrine assigns to those whom it *damns*, we are unacquainted.

"3d. Why does a merciful God permit innocent infants, lambs, doves, and other harmless animals, to suffer from disease, the cruelty of dogs, and still more inhuman man?"

This question is already answered, in our reply to the foregoing. Now we would wish to ask, Whether Mr. W. would like to admit that God's mercy is *finite*? That a sufficient reason *cannot* be given to satisfy a being who is *perfect* in mercy, for the permission of the present state of affairs? And we will also ask, as Mr. W. has promised to answer, First—Is the God you worship *able* to save all mankind, and to make them holy and happy? Second: When, and before God created man, in the aggregate, or an individual, did your God *know* the consequence to man, individually, and in the aggregate, whom he was about to create, of creating him? Had your God a *design*, extending to the final destiny of every man, when he created him? Was that design the *good* or *ill* of the creature? Is your future hell, a place of correction for the *reformation* of the sinner; or a place of *endless* torment? If your God

knew that man would be tormented endlessly, did he not make him for that express purpose? If he made him for this purpose, is not your God *cruel*? If he made him for another purpose, and he did not answer the purpose intended, is he not ignorant and impotent?

Note. Will Mr. Woodworth "have the *candour* and fairness to publish our replies, as given above? Come, Sir, '*fair play is a jewel*.'"

N. B. We wish it to be understood, that we believe it is not the province of any man to question, in any sort whatever, the motive or purpose of Deity in the creation of all animals below man. It would be the height of impious blasphemy, to speak evil of God, and accuse him of wantonly animating dust, and giving only being and suffering, as cause and consequence. Questions may be multiplied very unprofitably. Now there is one answer with us, for every question of the kind. God is infinite in wisdom, unbounded in goodness; and of almighty power to counteract and control all events, so that his beneficent designs shall be accomplished. Whatsoever he does is *best*, and for the *best*. For ourselves, our ignorance is too great to advise the Deity, and our confidence in his wisdom and goodness, too great to doubt his ability and faithfulness. We expect shortly to enter upon the delightful task of learning, in the regions of unclouded wisdom, his glorious works, and witnessing in the winding up of the great drama of human events, his wonderful power, wisdom, and goodness.

"REMARKS ON THE SABBATH DAY."

Which day in seven, is the day which God commanded to be kept holy? *Who* were commanded to keep the Sabbath day holy? Every honest man, let his sentiments be what they may, must answer. "The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, *in it* thou shalt not do any work," &c. It must also be confessed, that this day was never made a Sabbath to, or for, the *Gentiles*. We therefore demand of those who would *bind a yoke* about the neck of the public, and *coerce* the public, whether they can produce testimony to prove that God ever *altered* the Sabbath, from the *seventh* to the *first* day of the week? If they cannot do this, one of three things must be admitted; namely—The Sabbath day is *abrogated*—or it is now binding on all those to whom the law was given, and their posterity; or it is binding upon all men. If the Sabbath is abrogated, no one will be damned for not observing it. If the Sabbath is not abrogated, it is now binding on all the Jews. If it was not originally confined to them, it is now binding on all men. If it is now binding on all men, then all men, with the exception of Jews and Seventh-day Baptists, are outrageous *Sabbath-breakers*. The substitution of any other, or *every* other day, will not expiate the offence; nor by any correct rule of construction, prove the party to regard or comply with the Divine command. For the command is imperative—"The *seventh* day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, *in it* thou shalt not do any work." We therefore contend, on the authority of the above testimony and premises, that

any other day than the *seventh*, is not the Sabbath of the *Lord*, nor by him appointed.

We offer the above to the serious consideration of every honest and honourable man. We say to all, without exception, Unless you can disprove the above, by positive testimony, fresh from the oracles of *God*, (not of *man*), you are bound as honest and candid men, to admit the truth, and to govern yourselves firmly, openly, and impartially by its dictates. Farther, we appeal to all honest men, of all denominations, and ask, Is it not an outrageous *insult* to the good sense of mankind, and an inexcusable attempt upon the civil liberty of our country, hostile to, and subversive of, the constitution of these United States, for the *Reverend* clergy, so called, to *contradict* the positive declaration of *God*, that the *seventh* day is the Sabbath, and to declare that the *first* day is the Sabbath, and to plot and contrive to *coerce by law*, the observance of a day, that *God* never *hallowed*, nor commanded to be kept holy?

We urge, by every consideration dear to liberty, to *real* Christianity, serious and deliberate attention to the above. We expect the *pious* tongue of hirelings, and the voice of prejudice and ignorance, to be enlisted against us. We cannot help this. But, let all opposers remember, that our conceptions of our Heavenly Father are such, as to require the "presenting our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto *God*, which is our reasonable service." Rom. xiv. 1. And this on *all* days. We also believe, that "*Pure religion* and undefiled before *God*, even the Father, is this, To visit the *fatherless* and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." James i. 27. Any other religion than this, is neither *pure* nor *undefiled* in the sight of *God*! To all, therefore, we say, Would you be *religious*, you must do all the good, to those who need it, that you can; and serve your *God* with a *humble* heart.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—In the afternoon of Sunday before last, I attended the Vandewater-street church. As I had heard *Mr. Cumming* praised for his *charity* and liberality, I was very much surprised to hear him, when addressing the Throne of Grace, and after praying for "*all* mankind," in the next breath "*except* those who deny the infinitude of sin," &c. with other observations, which left no person of common sense to doubt for a moment whom he meant. Let me ask, If this is the "*charity*" of the *Rev. Doctor*, for which I have heard him extolled? If it is, we will say, "*Good Lord* deliver us" from all such. M.

New-York, Aug. 6, 1823.

Note. How much is the *Rev. Dr. Cumming's* prayers worth? ED. GOS. HER.

ANOTHER VICTIM

TO THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS TORTURE.

Mrs. S—, a matron of respectable connexions in this city, a short time since became a convert to Methodism. The present violent and boisterous

method of conversion, where threats of endless misery, instead of perstasion, are resorted to, produced mental distraction; and the wretched victim of fanatics cut her throat with a razor. Surgical aid, however, restored her to partial health of body, but the poison of error remained to torture her mind. She afterwards stabbed herself with a knife. She recovered from these wounds; and procuring a quantity of laudanum, crossed the East River, and was afterwards found in a field, a mass of putrefaction. Thus is added another to the long catalogue of victims to the doctrines of devils.

A Correspondent observes, that he heard the *Rev. Mr. Van Velsan* preach, August 10, when he said of the song of the redeemed, "There will be no singing of *hell-redemption* then," &c. and recommends to his attention, *Psa. lxxxvi. 13*, "Great is thy mercy toward me; and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell."

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"They (the redeemed) look down and see their own dearest kindred in *hell*, under all the bitter agonies of death, and they stand *unmoved at the sight*. They maintain perfect calmness, and *undisturbed joy*." REV. JOSHUA SPALDING.

O say, can sainted spirits look
Down from their glorious star-set thrones,
Joyous upon the lost; and brook,
Smiling, the damn'd soul's piercing groan?—
Look on the once lov'd spirit here,
And feel no anxious wish to snatch it thence,
E'en if a prayer could interfere,
And raise it to their eminence?

If it be so, then let me die,
And never reach that high abode
Of cruel bliss, above the sky,
Where man approximates to *God*.
If it be so, then let me fall
In the wild night of *hell's* despair;
And drink the wormwood and the gall,
And flame, for ever mingling there.

If it be so, when from this dream
My soul wakes in eternity,
O let it sink there where no gleam
Of light breaks on that shoreless sea:
For, rather than that change should be,
Who would not sooner writhe with them,
In that immortal agony,
Than thus wear heaven's diadem!

If it be so—but O, Most High,
Rebellious as it is, forgive
The thought, that would pollute the sky,
With spots too black in *hell* to live:
Forgive, and make the dark-one see,
Pity which reaches them that dwell
Beneath heaven's wide-spread canopy,
Can reach unto the lowest hell.

MARION.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRISTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1823.

NO. 15.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I have long been in the habit of perusing the Gospel Herald, and now take the liberty of asking your attention to the following considerations, which I esteem of some importance.

Mr. Spring (towards whose bigotry and error, I feel as much abhorrence as you possibly can) has for a long time, been the principal butt against which, have been levelled your arrows dipt in gall. On him have you poured forth the phials of your indignation, with a zeal, which (pardon me) would suit his cause, far better than the one in which you are engaged. He believes that many of the human race, are now, and will for ever remain, the objects of their Creator's unceasing hatred; for him therefore, to *hate* them, is to be a co-worker with the Almighty, and is perfectly consistent with his doctrine. But for you, who profess to be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, who bore with patience the contempt of the creatures whom he had himself formed, and died for their salvation—who has taught us by precept and example, *to do good for evil, and to overcome evil with good; not to return railing for railing, but contrary wise, blessings—* for you, I say, who profess to believe these divine truths, to indulge in the spirit of contempt, and bitterness, towards any of the human family, is both inconsistent and unjustifiable. Most truly, as well as beautifully has a poet said—

"That he who feels contempt, for any living thing,
Hath faculties within himself, which he
Hath never us'd. That thought with him,
Is in its infancy."

You will possibly say that it is the doctrine, and not the man, which has elicited so much severity. If this be the case, where is the necessity of being so personal? Aim at the error, or rather endeavour to establish the truth, and the gloom of superstition and infidelity will vanish, like the mist of the morning, before the luminary which creates our day, and which to every individual of the universe dispenses its innumerable blessings.

Satire is not a suitable weapon to wield in the cause of him, whose "tender mercies are over all his works," and who in accents of fatherly affection, says to his rebellious children, "Come, and let us reason together." As soon might you expect to see the child desire literally to kiss the rod under which he was then smarting, as that one, who writhed under the cutting lash of satire, should manifest love towards him who applied it; and a disposition coolly and candidly to investigate what he had asserted to be true. No! no! Blood for blood, lash for lash, is the feeling of fallen human nature.

Instead of producing a change, either in Mr. Spring or his congregation, I think you have pursued the most effectual means to keep them in their present state of Egyptian darkness. Will he feel disposed to peruse a work in which every thing, respecting him, is exhibited in the most unfavourable light? Or is it possible they who regard him with reverence and affection, will resort to a publication where the character of their spiritual guide is set up "for scorn to point its slow and moving finger at?" No; they will close the book in disgust, turn their ears from the testimony it contains, and return "good measure, pressed down, heaped up, and running over," for the injury they have received. Perhaps the best way for us to judge of the feelings of others, is to imagine ourselves in their situation, and then press the question home to our bosoms—How would I like to be treated thus? For however different the actions of individuals may oftentimes appear, the feelings by which mankind are actuated, and the motives which govern them, will be found very similar.

It is possible that you may attend the ministry of one, from whom you receive edification and comfort, and for whom you very naturally experience affection and gratitude. Should some Calvinistic bigot assail him with taunting and sarcasm, What would be your feelings; love, or hatred? In proportion as you thought him calumniated, would be your displeasure against his enemies. Being a stranger to you, I speak hypothetically. But should he, from whose lips I delight to receive the words of truth and consolation, be thus treated; (unaided by the knowledge that we are all children of the same Parent, and redeemed by the same Saviour,) I have no words to express my indignation. Nor would I give much for that man's heart, which should, under such circumstances, remain unmoved.

As to Mr. S.'s salary, that is a matter between him and his people, and cannot possibly concern any one who does not contribute to it. I know of no minister who is not remunerated for his services, and it is right that they should be; for though they may consider it a delightful employment to dispense the word of life, food and raiment are indispensable, and certainly those for whom they labour should be willing to afford them a subsistence. The Universalist minister in this city, has a salary, and I believe there are but few of his congregation who do not gladly contribute to it, and were they more wealthy, would, I have no doubt, willingly increase it.

So far from having any friendship for the Reve-

rend Doctor, beyond the feeling of universal fraternity, I am as perfect a stranger to him as to yourself. I have never heard him speak, nor ever read any of his productions, except his celebrated sermon on election, which I consider one of the most absurd things that has ever issued from the press. Affection for the cause you profess to advocate, and a desire that the most effectual means should be adopted for its extension, are the only reasons which have urged me to be thus explicit. Should you deem it inexpedient to publish this letter, it will gratify the writer, who addresses you in the sincere spirit of Christianity, to see this subject noticed in the next Herald.*

"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and evil speaking, be put away from you with all malice. And be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you"—is advice which we should constantly keep in remembrance. And, oh! that the HERALD may proclaim nothing but peace, and good-will from Heaven, to man; instead of war between individuals of the same family, is the fervent prayer of a "UNITED CHRISTIAN FRIEND."

New-York, July 24, 1823.

P. S. This was written before the last Herald appeared, in which was published a piece tending to exculpate you from the charge of ill-will, or malice, towards two clergymen whom you have severely castigated. Had this apologetical article appeared sooner, it might in some measure have precluded the necessity of my addressing you, but it may not be amiss even now, to send you these hints.

ANSWER.

We have read the above, and examined it, with great attention. The result is as follows—First. Our correspondent is grossly mistaken. Second. We are not the party alluded to, for we have never exercised the spirit, nor been exercised by it, which our correspondent speaks of, in any of our remarks or animadversions on the *Reverend Doctor Spring*. We shall prove this; and it will appear in the sequel, that our great Pattern, the Lord Jesus Christ, is also criminated by the "United Christian Friend," as well as the humble editor of this paper!

Our correspondent closed his communication with the following quotation—"Let all *bitterness*, and *wrath*, and *anger*, and *clamour*, and *evil speaking* be put away from you, with all *malice*. And be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you." By consulting James iii. you will learn, that only *two* spirits or moving principles, called wisdom, the one from above, and the other from beneath, operate on the minds of men. The one is "*earthly, sensual, devilish*," because contrary to God; and the other *full of mercy*, &c. and from God. God's wrath is "revealed from heaven, against all ungodliness and unrighteousness [unmercifulness] of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness."

To be godly, we must be against the same; a contrary course would be devilish. When Christ called the Scribes and Pharisees *hypocrites*, was he *bitter*? When he called them *serpents*, a *generation of vipers*, was he angry, clamorous, and an evil speaker? The spirit which governs the *Reverend Doctor*, is either the spirit of the Pharisee, or the spirit that is in Christ. If the Reverend Doctor is actuated by Christ's spirit, which is from above, we plead guilty to the charge. But, if the Reverend Doctor is governed by the contrary spirit, which is devilish, earthly, &c. and from beneath, we are guiltless in this thing.

Now we declare, that, to all the mental faculties we possess, the *Reverend Doctor* conducts as the Pharisees of old conducted. But words are superfluous—Who despises his neighbour? Who hates the creatures whom God hath made? Who struts, the consequential and proud Pharisee, rioting in abundance, while the widow and the fatherless are crying with hunger? Who make "clean the outside of the platter, but within are full of *extortion* and *excess*?" Who "build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous?" Who "bind heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but *they themselves* will not move them with one of their fingers?" Who "love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi?" Tell me who these are, and I will tell you who the spirit of the meek and lowly Jesus called "*hypocrites, serpents, and a generation of vipers*?" And we shall call them the same. The course Christ pursued, brought upon him the hatred and execration of the Pharisee and hypocrite. If we pursue the same course, we shall experience the same result. "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more *shall they call them* of his household?" Christ was never accused of hypocrisy, but of keeping the company of sinners! The holy men of His day, arrogated to themselves all the piety. Let their followers do the same. Christ bore with meekness the contempt of his enemies. We would do the same. We would render good for evil. But we would, in imitation of our divine Master, call things by their *right names*!

We have repeatedly said, and again declare, that we bear no ill will, and wish no evil to befall Mr. Gardiner Spring; nor any of his compeers in dignity and opposition. But we do say, and we would speak with redoubled energy, we bear wrath and indignation against the *conduct* of all *hypocritical Reverend Doctors*. We "*despise their image*." We rejoice that the wrath of God is revealed against the same, and that He also "*despises their image*." We ask, when did we ever complain, because of the contempt, or desire the countenance or smiles, or approbation, of the holy men and Divine Doctors of the day? When did we treat them with personal disrespect? When did we hate and wish them evil, as men? We are blamed for being *personal*. Was

* This communication, from some cause, was only received in season for the present Number. Ed.

Christ personal, when he rebuked the hypocrites of his day? See him, with outstretched arm, in open day, in the presence of the pretenders of old, telling them to their teeth, their true characters! Should we aim at the *error*, and leave the Divine Doctors in the back ground, we should be accused of slander, called the cowardly backbiter, and be told that our representations were the creature of our spleen, and malice. That we dealt in falsehood, and dared not name the party whose hypocrisy we exposed. We have the same *hated* in this case, that the surgeon bears to the *gangrenous limb* which he amputates, and the same motive too, to leave the body healthy.

We believe our faith is productive of good works. But heaven forbid that we should arraign the conduct of others, as men, and put ourselves in competition with them. The *best* man living, must blush at his imperfections, and this alone, is sufficient to produce humility. As a man among men, considered separately from his professions, his sacred office, his diploma, and his Hopkinsian principles, we believe Mr. Gardiner Spring is neither a better nor worse man than his neighbours. We know, that the time is coming, when he shall be purged in his person, of his errors and his pride, and in all love and humility, recognize ourselves, and all God's heritage, as brethren, with unbounded affection. We, therefore, again say, we condemn his hypocrisy—his pride—his folly—but we condemn not the *man*. Our correspondent must acknowledge, that the fact of the child not *kissing the rod*, is no evidence why the child should not be *whipped*, when he deserves it! We have no expectation of producing a change in Doctor Spring; neither did Christ expect to produce a change in the Pharisees of old, when he addressed them. But our correspondent is mistaken relative to his congregation. Numbers of them have acknowledged the justness of the remarks, and see the folly of a *Reverend Doctor's* infallibility. What effect, think ye, did the plain dealing of Christ have, with the admirers of the Pharisees of old? We answer. They hated him, persecuted him, and finally put him to the cruel death of the cross. Thanks be to God, and his good Providence, or we should suffer a similar fate. May God in mercy, if it be his will, let this cup pass from us; but not our will, but His be done.

Our correspondent asks, "How would I like to be treated *thus*?" How? Why, to be a *Reverend Doctor of Divinity*, with an *enormous salary*, and to have a Universalist, the worst of all denominations, question my pretensions, &c.? We acknowledge, candidly, we do not think we should like it at all. We believe we should feel about the same as the Pharisees of old, when their pretensions were called in question. But of all calamities, may a merciful Providence preserve us from the terrible condition of a modern *Reverend Doctor of Divinity*, puffed up with spiritual pride, and *cursed* with an *enormous salary*! We ejaculate, fervently, the prayer of Agur—

"Two things have I required of thee; deny me them not before I die. Remove far from me *vanity*

and *lies*: give me neither *poverty* nor *riches*; feed me with food convenient for me: lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, Who is the LORD? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." (Prov. xxx. 7—9.)

Our correspondent wishes to know how I would feel, to have my minister attacked, &c. &c. &c.? Adding, "Nor would I give much for that man's heart, which should, under such circumstances, remain unmoved." Please to hear my opinion of this matter. I would not give much for that man's heart, who, let the *honest* reproof come from any quarter, will uphold error, and pamper a proud Pharisee at the expense of the widow and the fatherless. We assert that we both have and shall exercise the right, to question, in strong language, the present abominable mode of pampering clergymen. Dr. S.'s salary may be, as a *pecuniary* concern, a matter between him and his congregation. We never questioned this. But we have questioned, and now question, the right of any number of men, professing to follow Christ, to pamper an individual, and tempt him to an useless, and *wicked* extravagance, of the goods intended by the great Giver, for all the sons and daughters of affliction. If all creation, without exception, dissents from this our opinion, we shall cleave to it the closer. It is an outrage upon common sense, to pamper an individual, for the *love of God*, when thousands are suffering from want and wretchedness! If this is not as clear as any thing can be, we must acknowledge, that, of all men, we are the greatest ignoramuses. Reader, if you would be charitable in the eyes of the world, and would be popular, fill your minister's pockets, and pamper him to gormandizing! But, if you would be despised in the eyes of the world, and copy the example of Christ, give to some person who *needs* your bounty. This is our advice, and we are sensible, that it is scriptural, and, therefore, despicable!

We assure our respected correspondent, that the cause we advocate, is the cause of God and humanity. And we thank him for the expression of his sentiments, and the opportunity which it affords us, again to reiterate ours. We are constrained to say, that we think, there is very little *true* religion in the world. We acknowledge there is much praying, such as it is, and a great deal of form, ceremony, and pretension. But, God forgive us, if we err, we are sometimes almost led to conclude, that religion, such as Jesus practised, is almost, if not altogether, proscribed! Religion, Sir, admits of no distinctions, no pre-eminence; unless you would excel your neighbour in *love*, and be dignified in *humility*. But, alas! pride and hypocrisy, are almost the order of the day. They are concomitants, and grow always in company. May a power higher than human direct, and a wisdom greater than human preside, and govern the congregations of believers of God's universal and unchangeable love. We venture to predict, that in proportion as those professing the faith of the salvation of all men, copy after the follies, extravagances, and ceremonies of other denominations, in that ratio will pure, and all reli-

gion, that is deserving of the name, disappear from among them. That pride, parade, and a despicable formula, will be about all that shall remain, a skeleton of their pretensions.

We conclude our reply, and remarks, by desiring our correspondent not to construe any thing we have said, to disrespect for his opinion or sentiments. We have expressed, in plain language, our sentiments. And we again declare, that whether Doctor Spring, or any other of the race of Adam, all of whom we delight to acknowledge as *brethren*, be spoken of, that we utterly disclaim all feelings hostile to the man, our *brother*, and only wage a war of extermination against his follies, which are his worst and only *enemies*. It is our duty, and we urge it as the duty of all men, (for all men are imperfect, and, in this mode of being, poor sinners,) to cover, with the mantle of charity, which is love, as much as in them lies, the imperfections common to this mode of being. There lives not the man, with all his pretensions and goodness, who dares, in the presence of his Maker, "first cast a stone" at even his greatest enemy. God is *good*, and our good Judge. It is enough for sinners to mend their own ways, and to exhort, with love and kindness, their neighbours to do likewise! But, we consider a *Reverend Doctor of Divinity*, to be a creature that God never made, and a genus that we will never acknowledge as claiming any affinity with any of the creation of God! We will not acknowledge, for a moment, any consanguinity which can possibly exist between these monstrous prodigies and ourselves. May Mr. Gardiner Spring, never have a greater enemy than the editor of this paper, is our *good* wish and desire.

From the Gospel Advocate.

THE DEVIL'S DOCTRINE.

Mr. Editor—The indefatigable industry of the believers and advocates of the doctrine of endless and unmerciful torments, in their opposition to Universalism, is strikingly exemplified in the assiduity with which they endeavour to propagate the idea, that the doctrine, "that all men will be saved," is the same as was taught by the devil in the garden of Eden.

Whenever they attempt a refutation of our doctrine, and fail to find their arguments supported by the Bible, reason, or common sense, they raise the cry that "Universalism is the devil's doctrine," and that those who attempt to defend it or preach it, are emissaries of his sable highness, armed with deception, and furnished with reasons which they stigmatize with the epithet, "carnal;" and would fain have us suppose that every word which is spoken in defence of the "restitution of all things," proceeds from the bottomless pit.

Now it appears to me, *Mr. Editor*, that Universalists have no more to do with the devil than others; for many, and a majority of them, deny even that such a creature exists; and all, as far as I am acquainted, unite in saying, that let him be what he may, he shall be destroyed, together with all his works.

Although the idea, that the doctrine of Universal Salvation is the same as that preached by the devil to Eve, has been often and ably refuted, yet the frequent use of the accusation against us, will serve as an apology for the following remarks.

In Gen. ii. 17, we read thus, "But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This is the declaration of God himself. The 4th verse of chapter iii. contains the devil's doctrine; "And the serpent said unto the woman, Thou shalt not surely die." The parties are now fairly at issue, and we shall contend that God told the truth, and that the devil told a lie. Now the question is, *Do Universalists preach God's doctrine, or the devil's?* Reader, you shall be the judge, and your neighbours the jury. We will imagine that the prisoner at the bar is a Universalist. Now let us ask a few questions, and listen to his answers.

Quest. Well, *Mr. Universalist*, what is the wages of sin?

Ans. "The wages of sin is death;" all sinners must die.

Q. What kind of death, is the wages of sin?

A. Moral, or spiritual death, "I die daily. I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died."

Q. Is there no way for the sinner to escape this death?

A. No—he shall surely die.

Q. When?

A. In the day he eateth thereof: "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner."

Q. Shall all men be saved notwithstanding all have sinned; and consequently are dead in trespasses and sins?

A. Yes, for "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound, that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Therefore, "forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he (Christ) also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage."

Reader, the above is Universalism. Does it sound like the devil's doctrine? We think not!

Now let us bring to the tribunal of an enlightened public, a gentleman, who, for the sake of brevity, we will call "Orthodox," let him be made to give answers to a few plain questions.

Question. Well, *Mr. Orthodox*, what is the wages of sin?

Answer. Eternal, or endless death.

Q. Are all mankind sinners?

A. Yes. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Q. Did God pronounce "endless death," as a punishment for sin, to our first parents in the garden of Eden?

A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Do mankind receive a recompense in the earth for their iniquity?

A. No. The wicked enjoy more happiness in this life than the righteous?

Q. Well then—If eternal damnation is the death mentioned in the Bible, and if sinners do not suffer this death, in this world, pray tell us if all men will be surely damned in the next, to all eternity?

A. No, no! If they repent before they leave this world, they shall escape this endless death, and be taken to heaven, where they shall sing the praise of God for ever. Christ has suffered in their stead, so that they shall not be punished for their transgressions!

Q. Then I must understand you to mean, that some part of mankind "shall not surely die!"

A. I wish not to be abused!

Reader, please make your own comments.

—♦—
From Zion's Herald.

ON THE IMPROPRIETY OF LONG PRAYERS.

Mr. Editor—My mind of late has been very much exercised with respect to public prayer. I have ever been opposed to long prayers, as disagreeable to persons in general; if it be so, they cannot be profitable, and what is not profitable, ought not to be practised. God does not require of us long prayers either in private or public, nor does the scripture any where speak in favour of it. There are many excellent treatises on the subject, but I know of none which have examined the Scriptures to ascertain the form and style of prayer, except those who have had an eye to some particular mode of worship, and of course their authors wrote from prejudice. Many examples are recorded in the sacred Scriptures, we may reasonably suppose, for our imitation. The longest prayers we find on record was offered by the Levites in the days of Nehemiah. (ix. 5-38.) This prayer may be distinctly pronounced in eight or ten minutes. Solomon's at the dedication of the temple, was a little shorter. (1 Kings viii. 22-68.) There are a number only four minutes, and a greater number only from two seconds to one minute in length. That most appropriate and beautiful prayer, offered by the apostles, when one of their number was selected to fill the place of Judas, might be repeated in less than a minute. Why should we deviate so much from the practice of the Old and New Testament-saints.

Many persons find it inconvenient to unite in the prayers of some persons because they cannot, for the great length of time that the prayer continues, keep their minds intent on the subject. Wandering thoughts are apt to arise, which destroy the solemnity, and cause us to forget the duties in which we are engaged. I would not undertake to say that the length of the prayer was the only cause of these feelings; there are others, such as the depravity of the human heart, the temptations of satan, and the cares of the world; but it would not be too much to say, the length of the prayers is one of the greatest.

When we unite with our brethren in prayer, our minds should be fixed upon each petition, or we cannot be said to unite. Many people fall into a great mistake, by supposing that when they are engaged in this duty they must pray for many and almost every thing that chance to enter their minds at that time, and those who can pray half an hour, are said to have the gift of prayer. I regret that a duty so important, a privilege so valuable, should be rendered tedious and irksome by continuing it to an improper length. Let us have the impression that a brother will pray short and we shall profit by it, on the contrary, if we expect he will be lengthy, we shall have but little disposition to follow him.

Long prayers are certainly unscriptural. Christ says of the Pharisees, *that they make long prayers and shall receive the greater damnation.* The opinion of the heathen was, *that they should be heard for their much speaking*; Jesus informs his disciples of this and exhorts them not to use vain repetitions. "The best manner of praying, (says Luther,) is to make only a few words, but such as contain a deep sense; the fewer the words, the better the prayer; few words and much sense is Christian. Many words and little sense is heathenish." Perhaps when the mind is engaged alone in the closet, the difficulty may not be so great; but I conceive it to be very great when we are united in prayer with one another. Some may perhaps say, "the writer is not devotional himself, which is the cause of these objections." To this I answer, that however this may be, we cannot judge of the devotion of another by praying long, or short. Will any one dare to say that a man is not devout, because he does not pray twenty minutes or half an hour? Was not Solomon devout at the dedication of the temple? Were not the disciples devout when they prayed for boldness, &c. that they might speak God's word? (Acts iv. 20-24.) Was not Stephen devout when he prayed under the shower of stones? Let us adopt the practice of short prayers, and strive for a spirit of devotion, and our prayer meetings will be attended with much pleasure and profit.

—♦—
FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

ON DÆMONIOLOGY.

Among all the errors, that have crept into the religions of men, there is none more prevailing, more fondly cherished by the ignorant and superstitious mind, and yet more absurd and groundless than that of Dæmoniology. According to the orthodox of the day, the economy of the Universe is two-fold. The Creator of man, and Great First-Cause, is represented as dividing his power and sharing his authority with the fallen angels; and by far the greater portion of mankind, though expressly declared to have been created for the glory of God, will ultimately become the imprisoned slaves of the Devil. Well may we say of Satan, if this doctrine be true, in the words of the Poet,

"Divisum imperium cum Jove tenet."

The race of men are represented as operated upon by two attractions, the one good, the other bad.

The Devil is supposed to be endeavouring to draw man from God's allegiance, while to counterbalance his influence, the spirit is made to warn man of his arts, and lead him back to God. Or, in plain, downright English, our Maker and the Devil are pulling at man.

Being myself a complete disbeliever in infernal agency, and believing with Pope, that the worst "enemy of mankind, is man," I shall offer a few reasons, first, from common sense, and next from scriptural authority, showing the fallacy of this belief. In the first place, if we believe in a God, as the Maker of the vast fabric of the universe, we must allow him infinite perfection, justice, power, wisdom and goodness. Being then infinitely wise, and foreseeing all things, He never would have permitted the existence of any thing that could derange his plans; his power being infinite, he would crush at once any thing contrary to his designs; and being infinitely good, he would never permit his intelligent and rational creature man, to be drawn from his power, and perverted by the agency of any extrinsic being. So far from the Devil being necessary to the arrangement of the universe, he is the direct contrary; his aim appears to be, to thwart and perplex the designs of God. Can any sensible man for a moment suppose, that an all-wise and omnipotent God, would wage war with one of his own creation? I remember a reply given by an ignorant savage to a Missionary, who was endeavouring to convert him to the Christian religion. Whatever appeared just, reasonable, and necessary, this artless child of Nature at once believed. That there was a great Being, by whom all things were made, who had created him and all mankind, by whose act he came into existence, who gave him a mode of being, faculties, and powers, suitable for his enjoyment of this world; who prepared the earth for his residence, and supplied all his wants; whose goodness was infinite, and who would punish him for his transgressions, and bring him to a right sense of his error, in following the paths of vice. All this he believed at once, this was plain; it needed no proof; he looked round upon the various gifts of the earth, and recognized the goodness of God. He heard the thunder and saw the lightning flash, and acknowledged his powers; but when his instructor attempted to inculcate the existence of an *adverse and counteracting power* under the name of the *Devil*, the unsophisticated and unprejudiced savage, refused to believe; and for the best reason possible, he saw no necessity for it. Does not God, said he, rule and govern all things? Does he not ordain and decree every thing? Yes, replied the priest. Why then, says he, did he let the Devil come, to disturb the harmony of the universe? Which is the *stronger*? God, or the Devil? *God*, to be sure, says the Missionary. Why then God no *kille the Devil*, and have no disturber of men? This the priest found an unanswerable argument, and left him to be converted by some more cunning reasoner.

But, perhaps, I may be accused of employing *reason* in opposition to, or neglect of scripture. I therefore proceed to my second position. And,

ab initio, that Moses knew nothing of such a being, is evident from his total silence upon the subject. He never once mentions it; and certainly, if any one knew of it, Moses, the divinely inspired historian, who gave an account of the creation of the world, &c. would have mentioned it.

We are told, that in the garden of Eden, the *serpent* tempted Eve, but it is not said this serpent was the *Devil*, or inspired by his Satanic majesty. It is said, the serpent was more cunning than any *beast* of the field, consequently, if he was more cunning than *any beast*, he must have been a beast himself, and therefore could not have been the Devil. A comparison is made between two things of the same kind, it would be as absurd to say that the Devil was more cunning than a mere beast, as to say that a man could read better than a horse. But an insurmountable objection follows, when the serpent had caused all this disturbance and calamity, he as the only cause is justly punished. Adam and Eve were afflicted, and a curse passed upon the serpent. Now, how ridiculous and absurd an idea, to suppose for a moment that God, the foundation of intelligence, could not see the Devil hid under the serpent's skin. Most assuredly the fiend was a very cunning deceiver, for he is made here to elude the all-searching eye of Omnipotence. What crime had the harmless beast of the field committed, that he should be so sorely afflicted. Ill-fated reptile, unhappy creature, thou, whilst reposing in the flowers of Paradise, wert in an unlucky hour seen by Satan, enticed by him, and made his organ of communication; and when all is consummated, he artfully retreats and leaves thee the victim of superior skill, the mere machine of infernal malignity, to receive the punishment due to himself. Thou wert as unlucky as the cat, who was employed by the monkey to steal his master's chesnuts, and whose paws suffered for Pug's theft. W. J.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD. THINGS AS THEY ARE.

Having heard that the *Reverend Doctor C.*— had promised Mr. D.—, from his pulpit, a Sermon which he was at the time preaching, I recently asked Mr. D. if he had obtained it? He said he had not; but if I would go with him, he would call and get it. I consented, and we accordingly went. On being introduced into the *Reverend Doctor's* parlour, and seated, the *Reverend Doctor* very gruffly asked, what Mr. D. wanted?

D. I called, Sir, to get the Sermon you had the politeness to offer me, and which some time since you promised to hand to me.

Reverend Doctor. Why do you want that Sermon, and what do you mean to do with it?

D. I want it for my satisfaction, and because you promised to give it me.

Reverend Doctor. You want it for some malicious purpose, and you are a malicious fellow. I have been advised not to let you have it.

D. I am sorry, Sir, you should treat me in such a manner as this; when I first called on you, you

treated me like a gentleman, but you do not now. I have no animosity to you; you promised me the Sermon at the time I was taking it down, and I now ask you for it.

Reverend Doctor. No gentleman would go into a church and write down a discourse—it is not a gentlemanly action.

D. Did you never see any gentleman writing in a church?

Reverend Doctor. No!

D. I do it to strengthen my memory. I have done it in my own church, and in almost every church in the city.

Reverend Doctor. There was nothing in it against Universalists, but I wish there was.

D. Will you give it me, Sir?

Reverend Doctor. No, I will not; you are *no gentleman*, you are a *liar* and a *blackguard*, and you shall not have it.

D. Then, Sir, I do not believe it is written in short hand. I have heard from two or three gentlemen that sat so near the pulpit as to be almost able to read it, that it appeared like a round hand.

Reverend Doctor. You tell me that it is not written in short hand! You insult me in my own house, and my house is my castle. My sermon is written in short hand, and I will produce it, and prove you a *liar* and a *poltroon*, and if I was not a *clergyman*, I would kick you out of my doors. You have called me a *liar*, or what is tantamount to it, in my own house, when you said you did not believe it was written in short hand. I shall prove it to you, Sir, and prove you a *rascal* and a *villain*, and then show you the way out of my doors. You have said, that I refused to give you the Sermon when you first called on me.

D. No, Sir, but I asserted you promised to bring it.

Reverend Doctor. You did, and I can prove it.

D. Give me your author.

Reverend Doctor. I will: [But he would not.]

A Sermon was produced; also an Address delivered before the Apprentices Society Library.—The Address looked as if recently written. The Sermon appeared to have been written a length of time, and was dated Albany, and written in short hand. The Address in round hand.

Reverend Doctor. Now, Sir, are you convinced that it is in short hand? Read it if you can!

D. O, yes, Sir, I am convinced that it is in short hand, but you promised to give it me with the key; do so and I can read it.

Reverend Doctor. You shall not have it. You are a *blackguard* and a *liar*, and *no gentleman*; and if I see you writing again in my church, I will have you put out.

D. You cannot do it; I know the law about that as well as you do, and will do it when I please.

Reverend Doctor. I know that all that has been said this evening, will be misrepresented in the pages of the Gospel Herald; and you may do it as soon as you please, and send me one. I ask *no quarter*, and shall give none; and I will take it in my back-house, as I have done sixteen others, and * * * * *

[The *Reverend Doctor* here used language and gestures which would disgrace a *layman* to relate!]

During the time this conversation, and much more of the same kind, plentifully interlarded with *rascal! scoundrel! poltroon! blackguard! villain!* and no gentleman, by the *Reverend Doctor*, addressed to Mr. D. was passing, I sat a silent, but attentive hearer, except when the *Reverend Doctor* referred to me to examine his MSS. and to know whether Mr. D. had not said he did not believe it was written in short hand. I told him Mr. D. did say he did not believe it, but not until he, (the *Reverend Doctor*) had said he should not have it, which he tacitly admitted.

On leaving the house, Mr. D. told him he bore no animosity to him, and wished to shake hands with him on parting, as *friends*; but the *Reverend Doctor* would not, and slammed the door shut in our faces. This is, according to the best of my memory, which is not a bad one, a true statement of what passed at the *Reverend Doctor's* house, on the night of the 15th of August, without exaggeration, between the *Reverend Doctor* and Mr. D.

My name, if requested,

A SPECTATOR.

We caution the reader not to mistake in conjecture. It is the "*Reverend Doctor of Divinity*" whose conduct is exposed. No man would conduct in this manner. ED. GOS. HER.

"LET THERE BE LIGHT."

We believe the mandate of Jehovah has gone forth, and the clouds of ignorance and error must vanish. The following, from the "*Gospel Palladium*," published at Warren, (R. I.) is certainly indicative of a wonderful march of sentiment, and freedom of inquiry and expression. We are highly gratified in witnessing this dignified, honourable, and honest course, which is pursued by the Editor of this paper. And we frankly acknowledge, that we never expected to find a gentleman of the Baptist persuasion, so free from the prejudices of education, and the rugged tenets of modern times. The Baptists in this city have much to learn, and we hope will now begin the task.

From the Gospel Palladium.

ORIGINAL ANECDOTE.

In a town, not fifty miles from Warren, a lady of respectability and intelligence applied to the Pastor of a certain church to be admitted as a member, and after disclosing to him her religious experience and views of Christian doctrine, he in the usual manner propounded her for membership. Previous to her admission, several of the members of the church, knowing that the lady was a Unitarian in sentiment, wrote to the Pastor, that if she were admitted to the communion they would leave it. Alarmed by this information, the Pastor waited upon the lady to have further conversation upon her religious sentiments, and to state the objections which had been made to her reception. In the course of the conversation, the lady stated her disbelief in the *personality of the devil*. Upon which

the Pastor gravely informed her that with her Unitarian views he had no difficulty, but her disbelief of the *personality of the devil*, was an insuperable objection, in his mind, to her admission into the church, and she was accordingly refused. Happily for the lady, however, there was in the same town a liberal Pastor and a liberal church, who required no other confession of faith, but that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and a determination to imbibe his spirit, obey his precepts, and imitate his example," with which she is united, where she may "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made her free."

Mr. Editor, when this circumstance was related to me, I could not help regretting that at this late period of the world, any should be found among us who consider "faith in the *devil*," a necessary pre-requisite to admission into the *Church of Christ*. If a person was about to join the "synagogue of *satan*," a belief in the existence of his satanic majesty might be deemed necessary; but to unite with "the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," I should judge that to believe in one God, the Father of all things, and our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, is all that any reasonable person would require.

Yours respectfully, ANTI-DIABOLOS.

TITHES.

Our orthodox brethren have an "itching palm" for the people's money. They openly advocate the system of tithes. Our pious ancestors sooner than have submitted to this abominable imposition would have perished in tortures. "When the people in the time of Nehemiah," says the Boston Recorder, "neglected to bring in the TITHES, the Levites fled to their fields, and the house of God was forsaken. * * * Ought not greater efforts to be made to support ministers, as well as to educate them? * * * If the people were willing to give as much for the support of religious teachers as God's chosen people were required to give, *nine families* could support a minister. * * * Were God's professing people, under a former dispensation, ever impoverished by "bringing in all the tithes into the store-houses? It was the neglect to support the worship of God that made them poor." So far this orthodox writer is fair and candid, and therefore, I respect him for his frankness. He speaks out and says in substance, "I wish to introduce the Jewish and English system of tithes into the United States." One minister to *nine families* is a great improvement. It would make the clergy thicker than in Portugal or Naples. After this, let not Mr. Willis pretend to be friendly to our free institutions. If he believes that tithes and religious liberty can exist together, he must be grossly ignorant of both. His ignorance must equal his fanaticism and bigotry, which is saying a great deal.

Plain Truth.

LIBERALITY.

The Editor of the Philadelphia "Religious Remembrancer," notices a statement in the Fourth

Volume of this Paper, p. 68, of the increase of Societies of the faith of the salvation of all men, and introduces a quotation as follows:

"*Religion of Universalists*. Text: 'Real religion progresses in exactly the ratio that liberal feelings and opinions are cherished.'" He then has a quotation, stating the abominable, cruel, &c. principles of Calvinism, and expresses his opinion that *real* religion must be at low ebb among Universalists, &c. We wish to correct the gentleman's error. *Liberality*, if we know any thing about it, does not consist in calling white black, nor crooked straight. When Calvin burnt *SERVETUS*, he was illiberal. A just delineation, or exhibition of the horrible principles which led Calvin to that wicked act, is liberal. Liberal men are willing to investigate the truth. Illiberal men are for coercion, by "public law," and torturing all who dare to think for themselves. Now we are so liberal as to acknowledge, that ninety-nine Calvinists out of a hundred, are ashamed of Calvin's sentiments; and they are better men, the less they are influenced by Calvin's principles, and we add, that they are very little influenced by them, in ordinary life. But, we tell this gentleman, that *liberal* men do not accuse their opponents in sentiment, of advocating doctrines they detest and deny. You accuse Universalists of preaching the devil's doctrine, and saying, "*Ye shall not surely die*." That you may be more liberal in future, and more *honest* too, we caution you not to repeat this falsehood. Universalists preach, with Paul. "As in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ *all be made alive*." This, Sir, is our doctrine, and you must be careful not to implicate Paul as being a co-preacher with your devil.

NEW SUBJECT OF PRAYER.

The editor of the "*Christian Mirror*," in an article over the signature of "Another Subscriber," not only continues to recommend *his own* paper, but suggests the propriety of making it a *particular subject of prayer*, as are colleges, missions, &c. Though such recommendations and proposals would appear quite as well from some other paper, we will wave that point, and inquire, whether we may with propriety, suggest a few things for which prayer should be offered, concerning the "Mirror." We had thought of proposing *prayer* that the editor may not again be so imprudent as to publish statements of *facts* which reflect the most degrading dishonour on the *State of Maine*, by pretending that "many of the people are so enveloped in moral darkness," as not to know there is such a name as *JESUS CHRIST*. If his story was any thing like the truth, let them pray that the Mirror may strike up a brisk exhortation for all foreign missionaries to return forthwith, and first convert our heathen at home, not being discouraged though a few may be found so enveloped in moral and *mental* darkness, as to relate, or believe, such totally incredible and absurd statements.

Chris. Intel.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1823.

NO. 16.

SPIRITS IN PRISON.

Several correspondents having requested some comment on the passage containing the subject of the "spirits in prison," we offer the following remarks, aware, however, that some may differ, perhaps dissent almost altogether, from our view of this passage. The reader must think for himself, and make his own comments, if what we offer do not suit him.

1 PETER iii. 18—20.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water."

The ordinary comment on this passage is simply an expression of the literal reading of the translation, with the exception of making the preaching, by Christ, to be by his spirit through the medium of Noah. This view admits one truth which we shall contend for; that man, in this mode of being, so long as he remains an unbeliever, is *in prison*. There are those, however, who stoutly contend, that the "spirits in prison" are those who were contemporary with Noah, and destroyed by the flood; and that Christ, during the time that intervened between his crucifixion and resurrection, while his body was entombed, actually preached to those imprisoned Antediluvians in *another mode of being*.

We dissent from this view of the subject, for the following reasons. First: The passage, when correctly understood, and compared with other testimonies, will not admit of it. Second: The impartiality and goodness of God, is not reconcilable with this view of the subject. Third: It is not the most reasonable construction of the passage.

To give our own opinion at once, we will say, that the apostle was speaking of the different Providence of God, under two dispensations. In Noah's time (the *first* dispensation,) men were the same as at the time Christ came, being "*without God in the world*." It pleased God to let the Antediluvians remain thus, until he took them away by the flood. But, in the *second* dispensation, when Christ came, God was pleased, by the quickening of Christ, to employ his Spirit to preach unto sinners of the same stamp, and instead of sweeping them from the earth, in blindness of mind, and hardness of heart, to enlighten their understanding; as expressed in chap. iv. 6, "For, for this cause was the gospel preached

also to them that are *dead*, that they might be *judged* according to men in the *flesh*, but live according to God in the *spirit*." All *unbelievers* are *dead* in trespasses and sins. Those spoken of were to be judged according to their *real* condition, for they were in the *flesh*, and a different result was to be produced from that of Noah's time. They were to be judged in the *flesh*, and to live unto God in the *spirit*, while in the *flesh*. If it is said, Nay, but they were judged *without the flesh*, as though they lived in the flesh; we answer—Then they lived according to God *without the spirit*, as though they had possessed, or been influenced by his *spirit*. This conclusion, if you adopt this mode of reasoning, we think will be unavoidable.

It is evident from Scripture, that *all* men, a part of the Jews only excepted, were "*without God in the world*," anterior to the coming of Christ. Consequently, unless God is a *partial* Being, the condition of all will be the same in another world. Had Peter intended to convey an idea similar to the one now entertained of this passage, he unquestionably would have included all of Adam's race, who had died before the Christian era. Otherwise, we must suppose, either that God was *partial*, in extending his Gospel to a part, or that the residue did not need it, therefore were not in prison. But the identical time is marked out, in the order observed by the apostle. We are told, first, that Christ *suffered* for sins. Second: The *manner* of his suffering, being put to *death in the flesh*. Third: That Christ was *quickened*, after he was put to death; and he was quickened by the *spirit*; by which, he preached to the *spirits in prison*. The preaching was *after* Christ's resurrection. Could he then go and preach, through Noah, to those who had been removed from the earth, and the flesh, for so many centuries? None will ever admit this. And it would also be doing violence to the passage, we think, to contend that Christ preached, by Noah, *before* he was put to death in the flesh, or quickened by the spirit.

If it is contended that the spirits were imprisoned posterior to this mode of being, we then ask, *Where* were they imprisoned? In *hell*, or Heaven? If it is said, In *Heaven*. Then, we say, let them remain in their prison; if you would call Heaven a prison. But, if you say, In *Hell*. We shall ask for proof; pledging ourselves to establish the position, that the Scriptures speak of no hell which is not both located and endured in this life.

Our friends who pretend to be orthodox, are unwilling to admit that Christ preached to any spirits *out of the body*. They have a peculiar aversion to every thing which makes against their favourite

hell, and delightful endless misery. We do not expect they will approve of our objections to this part which is so disagreeable to them, because we have a substitute which strikes a blow quite as deadly and destructive, to their future miseries, which, charitable souls, they piously reserve for their neighbours. If our comment, thus far, is favourably received, it must be by those, who, however they may partially dissent from us in opinion on minor points, are not only willing but desirous, that their greatest enemies, if they have any, should be saved.

The apostle, in this passage, appears to have his eye fixed intently on the *character* of Christ, the nature of his kingdom, and the *offices* he should perform. Probably in allusion to the prophet Isaiah, (xlii. 6, 7.) by whom God speaks as follows—"I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant [not to, but] of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to [do what? Ans.] open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." Is the prison and darkness, here spoken of, in another world? O, no! Well, then, the spirits in prison were in the same place, with the prison itself. When was Christ "given [not sold,] a covenant of the people, [not the elect,] for a light of the Gentiles?" (The nations.) Was it while Noah was building the Ark? If not, then it appears that the people, the Gentiles, (the nations,) are the "spirits in prison!" To us, the above conclusion is irresistible. Probably the reader may have some objection to receive it, on account of his supposition that the phraseology of 1 Peter iii. 20, cannot be any way construed to arrive at the same result. We acknowledge there is little harmony with the obvious import of this verse, and our exposition of the subject supposed to be contained in it. But the reader will please to remember, that our view is in perfect accordance with God's declaration by his prophet. Consequently, Peter and his Maker and instructor, are disagreeing! Is this the conclusion? No! By no means. It is the translators of the epistle of Peter, and not Peter himself, who are the authors of the discrepancy. Peter is speaking of God's dealing with men, in the *flesh*, whose conduct was as disobedient as those of Noah's day, when the ark was preparing, &c. Not that Christ, after he was crucified, and quickened, preached in Noah's day and generation, which would be an absurdity. Neither that Christ preached by Noah, before he was put to death. Nor are we to understand Peter to mean, that Christ preached before he was quickened, while his body lay the victim of the grave; but, that Christ, after his resurrection, preached, by the Spirit of God that quickened or raised him from death unto life, unto men imprisoned in the darkness of unbelief. We conclude, by offering to the consideration of the reader the following, which is the best translation of this passage, probably extant. We believe it is Wakefield's.

"For even Christ suffered once for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death indeed in the flesh, but

restored to life by the spirit; in which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison; such as in former times were hard to be convinced; as when the long-sufferings of God earnestly waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few (that is, eight) lives were saved by water."

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—It is painful to every charitable and benevolent mind, to witness the various, and I may safely say, *unhallowed* measures resorted to by opposers of the Doctrine of God's Universal Goodness, to impede the progress of that glorious and soul-cheering sentiment. With them, it would appear that the motto is, "*the end justifies the means,*" and however illiberal or uncharitable the course may be, to which they resort, if it but produces the effect to divert the attention of one solitary being, from a consideration of, or examination into, this "*Licentious and destructive heresy,*" as they please to term it, all seems well in their estimation. Judging from their conduct, we need not longer abide by the hard and unreasonable Doctrine of Paul,—("Shall we do evil, that good may come? GOD FORBID,") but may freely indulge in any excess of evil, if there is a prospect of the least possible good resulting therefrom. This is not an exaggerated picture. Our daily experience and observation prove the truth of it. We see every social and charitable feeling trampled under foot,—every principle of that benevolence and good-will which ought to exist between man and man, outraged and set at defiance, by those who are striving to prejudice the public mind against that Doctrine which teaches that "*God is Love,*" and that he is the Father, Benefactor, and Preserver of all, and that mankind are all Brethren.

With the utmost stretch of charity, we cannot but believe that these opposers many times *know better*, than to make the assertions that they do, or pursue the course they frequently take. Their opportunities of acquainting themselves with the principles of the Doctrine, and of witnessing the effects of it in those who profess it, cannot but teach them the falsity of their assertions, and the impropriety of their conduct. An instance I know, which follows, and out of his own mouth the person stands condemned. A Rev. Gentleman of my acquaintance, discoursing upon "*Dangerous errors,*" adverted to Atheism, Deism, and Universalism. His main battery appeared to be aimed at Universalism, knowing, I suppose, that there were many of that profession in the vicinity. In the course of his observations he remarked,—"*Let this Doctrine, (Universalism) my brethren, be generally received, and vice and iniquity may stalk through our streets with impunity,—the assassin may go forth in open day and wreak his vengeance on any one he chooses,—and it will be even a mercy for us to take the lives of our nearest and dearest connexions, to remove them from this troublesome life to a better and happier one!!*" I was present and heard the declaration, and at the time, charitably considered the speaker ignorant of our Doctrine. For on no other ground could I ac-

count for such singular conduct, unless I regarded him as the worst of all characters, a—*Hypocrite*—asserting that which his own experience would teach him was positively *false*. Not long after this, the same Rev. Gentleman, freely and unhesitatingly acknowledged, in a conversation I had with him, “*That so far as his acquaintance extended with those of our profession, [and there were many known to him as such] he had not aught against their moral conduct—that they were, generally, worthy and upright citizens—that he did not experience half the opposition, or ill-will from them, that he did from those of his own society, and that he knew not, but the writer of this, was on as good a footing as regarded his eternal welfare as he was himself!*” To render the absurdity of his conduct complete, in another conversation with me, about two or three months after, he *denounced* the profession wholly—in effect, calling them the *offscouring of society*—“*There never was,*” said he, “*that person in existence who believed the sentiment, and manifested the least fruit of righteousness or good works!*” How, or in what manner the Rev. Gentleman in question can reconcile these several declarations, I know not—to me, they are inexplicable. A *consistent* course of opposition is not so much to be wondered at—for if they *call the Master of the house Beelzebub, much more will they, those of his household*. But, that they should, as it were, thus “*blow hot and cold*” with the same breath, is wholly unaccountable.

I have been led, Mr. Editor, more immediately to these remarks, from the perusal of an article in the Religious Intelligencer of Aug. 2d, under the head, “*Effects of Universalism*”—which accompanies this, and which you will please to copy into your columns, for the benefit of such of your subscribers as may not have an opportunity of seeing it otherwise. Setting aside the *authenticity* of the story it contains, there is such a flow of *benevolence, good-will*, and above all, of that *Heaven-born charity*, which “*beareth all things,—believeth all things—hopeth all things—and endureth all things,*” manifested throughout the remarks, that the reader will insensibly be led to award to the writer all the credit due him, “*for this feast of reason—and this flow of soul.*” He must rise from the entertainment it affords him, with the most exalted views of the writer’s *candour and liberality*. The spirit he has manifested, is so *widely different* from that which led a certain character to “*thank God he was not as other men,*” or to exclaim—“*Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou!*”—it is so *perfectly in unison* with that *meek—that humble—that child-like* disposition, so eminently exhibited in the life and conduct of Him who is set forth for our example, that it cannot but arrest the attention of every candid and rational person. They will unavoidably be led to exclamations of wonder and amazement, at this *new—this rare—and unprecedented* exhibition of the *Christian graces!!!*

But to be serious, Mr. Editor, what can we rationally suppose must be the spirit that dictated such remarks as “*M. S.*” has sent forth to the

world, under his *solemn invocation* to Deity to accompany them with a blessing? That *profane swearing* and *intemperance* are shameful and destructive vices, we readily admit; but that they should, therefore, be identified with the doctrine of the “*Restoration,*” or restitution spoken of by all God’s holy prophets since the world began, we protest against. It is the most *illiberal and unchristian-like* conduct. Being reviled, we would not wish to revile again, but would seriously urge “*M. S.*” to hold “*the Mirror up to view,*” that he may learn what manner of spirit he is of. We ask him, and the Editor who first suffered such sentiments to pass through his columns; whether it exhibits “*compassion upon the ignorant and those out of the way?*” Whether it is exhorting with all *meekness, forbearance* and *long-suffering?* Whether it is “*doing unto others, as you would wish them to do unto you?*” And, finally, Whether it accords with the injunction of our Master, recorded Matt. v. 43—45? We ask them from whence they derive authority for thus *deliberately slandering* their fellow creatures—their brethren too, whom they are under the most solemn obligations to “*love as themselves?*” Whence their evidence for such assertions as these—“*And so it is, that intemperance and Universalism, are, with few exceptions, eventually identified.*” We cannot but think them *fully sensible* of the *falsity* of such declarations. Visit the dram-shop, if you please, go to that poor distressed object, who is *reeling* from the Bar in search of something to stretch his *paralyzed* frame upon—ask him if he believes in the “*final restoration of all men to holiness and happiness?*” and with all the *indignation* he is master of, he will tell you “*No!*”—and ten to one if he does not confirm his testimony against it with some *horrid oath*. Range the community of drunkards through, and you will find ninety-nine out of an hundred giving the same reply. Where, then, shall we look for their motive in thus “*bearing false witness against their neighbours,*” unless we find it in the *same course* which led certain in ancient time to exclaim, “*Great is Diana of the Ephesians!!!*”

One word more to the writer of these *truly charitable remarks*. By turning to James i. 26. he will find these words—“*If any man among you seem to be religious and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that man’s religion is vain;*” which may not be wholly unprofitable for his consideration. In the story given by “*M. S.*” in connexion with the remarks we have adverted to in the preceding, there is such a *faithful portrait* given of a *living character*, that had not the “*hero of the tale*” been pursued to his death, we should almost have been led to consider it as alluding to their late favourite “*author,*” bolstered up with his “*thirteen recommendations,*” of *gentlemen, lawyers, reverends, and doctors of divinity!!!* But as we believe he is still “*frequently wandering without home or sustenance, unless supplied by the hand of pity*”—we are forced to consider it a fabrication, and to be found only in the writer’s own *distempered brain*. If true, why is he so cautious in concealing every circum-

stance which could possibly lead to an examination of the truth of it. Is he afraid to come to the *light*, "*lest his deeds should be reprov'd?*" We are gravely told in the story, that the companions of the deceased were "going to abandon every effort to bury the body, until it was determined to fire the building, if they did not, which would endanger other property." Is there no law against the firing of buildings, and that too, to the destruction of other property? We think there is, and if we mistake not, heavy penalties are annexed. In short, Mr. Editor, the story carries such evident marks of *fabrication* on the very face of it, that few will be disposed to give any credit to such *stuff*. If it is true, let them come forward and give the names of the persons concerned, the place where it occurred, and the time when it transpired, and then, possibly, it may lead the community to a much closer "attention" to the vicious tendency of these "deluding and soul-destroying Doctrines!!" as this charitable writer terms them. ————— P.

From the (New-Haven) Religious Intelligencer.

EFFECTS OF UNIVERSALISM.

The sins of intemperance and of profane swearing, which are but too commonly practised in many parts of our country, are indisputably to be classed with the most shameful and destructive vices.

The errors of Socinianism, Universal Salvation, or restoration, which are now uniting under the softer name of Unitarianism, are among the most deluding and soul-destroying doctrines.

The connexion between those shameful and ruinous vices, and those dangerous and destructive errors in doctrine, deserve much greater attention than is generally bestowed upon it. When men begin to indulge themselves in the above named vices, their consciences alarm them, and the salutary reproofs of their friends, frequently occasion some uneasiness of mind, and it is natural for them to seek some solace for the mind, and some shelter from the attacks of their friends. Nothing meets these objects so happily as the doctrine of Universal Salvation; because this frees them from all apprehension of danger, retorts the folly in the face of the reprover, and casts the odium upon the ignorance or superstition of their friends. Thus it is seen, that the indulgence of sin draws them certainly into the vortex of delusion and error. It is also observable that when men of decently moral habits, through carelessness, inattention, or design, fall into the above errors in doctrines, that they soon neglect religious instruction, profane the Sabbath, hastily and insensibly slide into intemperance and profanity, and often terminate their career in ruin and despair.

These facts are so notorious, that where a poor intemperate, profane creature is seen wallowing in his pollution, that it is frequently asked: *Is he not a Universalist?* So on the other hand, if it is observed that such a man has become a Universalist; it is inquired, *Has he not become a drunkard too?* Or if it be remarked that Universalism is increasing in such a town or neighbourhood, the inquiry

will be, (to use a cant phrase) *Are there not a plenty of whiskey-mills there?* And so it is, that intemperance and Universalism are, with few exceptions, eventually identified. I hope that the publicity which is hereby given to the following, as a fact which may be rested on, as having taken place a short time past, may be blessed for reproof and for instruction in righteousness.

In a certain village there are a number of men, who embrace the doctrine of Universal safety or restoration. Many of them are men of intemperate habits, who frequently, if not constantly, meet on the Sabbath, and indulge their festivity and raillery. Whether the errors in doctrine first led them into this degeneracy of manners and looseness of habits, or the corruptness of habits, into the errors of doctrine, is immaterial to the present account. One of them, however, who had strangely combined these together, in consequence of his numerous and offensive vices had forsaken his family, and in despite of the efforts of a benevolent and virtuous companion, had sunk into poverty and the lowest degradation wandering frequently without home or sustenance, unless supplied by the hand of pity. It appears, however, that by some exertion he had obtained a gallon of whiskey; and on the day he was passing with his bottle, he was heard to swear that he would now enjoy it, that he would enjoy it alone, that he would not be thwarted by his companions. He was afterwards seen going towards a neighbouring wood: but little notice was taken of his conduct, it was so common. Nothing farther transpired till the Sabbath, when his companions being together at the tavern, in the midst of their dissipation, one of them inquired what had become of ——. No one recollected to have seen him for several days, or after the transaction of Thursday. This excited some alarm, a general search was made, but in vain. At length some little boys recollected to have seen him on Thursday evening going towards an old house which had been some time vacated. They ran, and upon opening the door, beheld him an awful and detestable object. They communicated the intelligence. He had lain near three days. The weather was very hot. He had become so disgusting and loathsome, that his companions themselves were going to abandon every effort to bury the body, but it being determined to fire the building if they did not, which would endanger some other property, they nailed up a coarse box, and with pitch-forks and shovels or similar instruments, to the no small exposure of their health and lives, at length succeeded in rolling him into the box, and with the assistance of a horse or oxen, dragged it to the pit. An individual passing near the house on Thursday evening, recollected to have heard such awfully profane cursing and swearing, as upon deliberation, prevented him from going in—or from making any inquiry into the cause of it. Thus ended the *drunkard* and the *Universalist*. "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness." It had been hoped that this event would have produced a salutary effect, but when the Ethiopian can change his skin, and the leopard his spots then he who is accustomed to do

evil may learn to do well. May God grant that they who read may be mended. M. S.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dear Brethren—It is with sensations which I do not recollect ever to have experienced, that I write this letter. It is well known to many of you, that for more than seven years, I had the honour of being an acceptable member of your communion. I commenced the study of theology some years ago with the sole object of making myself useful to the Methodist connexion; but my investigations have led me to reject what you consider the marrow of the gospel. I was very willing to believe (in divinity) all that you requested of me; but I could not believe without evidence; and it is little more than a year, since I have given up all expectations of obtaining it.

I always doubted the doctrine of *endless misery*; but thought it *might* be true; and that my unbelief proceeded from ignorance; for I thought so many whom I esteemed as *ministers and fathers* in the church must be right, and heartily wished myself like them.

While I was assisted and directed in my theological studies, I was without a guide or prepossession, in philosophy; and my mind, ever on the stretch to solve the various phenomena, which I saw surround me, at length dispelled the darkness, and led me to certain and inevitable conclusions, which I very soon perceived I could not reconcile to what I had been taught was true divinity. I knew very well that what was false in philosophy could not be true in theology. Such, however, was my affection for you, my brethren, that I resolved not to leave you; and to avoid being expelled, I thought of studying medicine, and was on the very eve of laying aside all ideas of continuing in the ministry, when I found I could not reconcile it to my conscience; and that as I was a citizen of the world, I was responsible for my conduct to a higher tribunal than a sectarian platform of faith; and that I ought to act from a higher motive than merely the opinions or feelings of the wisest or most pious of my religious friends. I have no intention of impeaching the motives by which I think a large majority of you are actuated—I do think you sincere, and if it were in my power I would still live on terms of Christian friendship with you, but I have good reason to believe it will be impossible, except in a few instances. It is true, I think early prejudices keep you from the truth; but I make a difference between an error of the head and one of the heart—honesty being all that is essential to goodness.

As I had never read any Universalist books, nor heard any preaching till I espoused the doctrine, you will easily perceive that reason and the Scriptures were my only guide. I can truly say (and I believe you who are acquainted with me, will not doubt it) that it has been my anxious desire and prayer, to know and understand the truth. I am unable to say what I may hereafter believe; but this I can

say, that I *now as firmly* believe that all mankind will be restored to holiness and happiness, as I believe that they will exist after the death of the body. Indeed, I believe what is called orthodoxy, is well calculated to make *sceptics*. Beginning with the church of Rome, and passing through the various grades of orthodoxy down to Universalism, I really think the more orthodox the worse, and the more heterodox the better, till we arrive at the last mentioned doctrine, which alone is consistent with the whole tenor of the Scriptures and common sense. I have not embraced the doctrine of the final happiness of all men, without the strongest conviction of its *truth*; nor rejected the doctrine of endless misery, but from a full conviction that it cannot be supported by any fair interpretation of the Scriptures, or by any course of logical reasoning from the justice, goodness, wisdom, and power of the Deity. Believing as I do, in the truth of the Scriptures, and having *no doubt* that they teach in the most positive manner the doctrine of Universal Salvation, I feel myself bound by the most solemn and sacred obligations to use my utmost influence (however small) to diffuse its light among my fellow men. As I believe nothing can be more laudable in public teachers, than to disseminate what they conscientiously think the truth, I shall always respect an honest zeal in those from whom I differ; and all I ask, is, "that mercy I to others show."

TRUTH alone is my object, and truth has nothing to fear from a contrast with error, or the closest investigation. If you are in an error, my brethren, (and who knows that you are not) it is to your advantage to be convinced of it; and as I certainly think you are, you will not take it ill in me, in pointing out to you in a candid manner, what I consider the most exceptionable parts of your system and articles of faith. 1. Let me ask those of you, who are versed in the New Testament, and church history, If you have any authority for Episcopacy? You cannot be ignorant that the primitive churches chose their own pastors. "One is your Master *even Christ*"—Are ye not then all brethren? Is not Episcopacy an appendage of monarchy; and every way unworthy a free and enlightened people? 2. What are the qualifications you require in those you authorize to preach? If a young man, entirely ignorant of the Scriptures and every species of literature, except being able to read and write, be operated upon in a reformation; and in the moment of his religious excitement fancies himself called to preach; if he can speak fluently, is he not sent forth to teach mankind without any other reason to offer, why they should believe, than that they will be damned if they don't; and who knows of no other way by which men can become virtuous, but by passing through the same animal and mental excitement they themselves experienced? After a young man is thus taken on a *circuit*, what opportunity has he of getting knowledge? It is true, that some who have a thirst for learning, which nothing can remove, obtain much general information; but of your thousands of preachers in the United States, where are your respectable authors? Is not your

whole system unfriendly to literature? What opportunity can men have for study, whose every moment is occupied in travelling, preaching, and visiting from house to house? Is it not an opinion among you, that your most ignorant preachers are the most useful in getting up awakenings? How often have I heard it said, that such and such preachers had lost their usefulness, when no other reason could be assigned, than that they had become dispassionate, and had laid aside that fiery zeal and positiveness, by which their first preaching was characterized! I ask this serious question, Is not your form of church government calculated to impede the growth of the mind? Who among you dare publish a book without the consent of the Conference? Who dare preach a sermon without consulting the discipline more than the Bible? What room can there be for improvement while every preacher is bound by the same chain, and no one dares for a moment to call in question the infallibility of the discipline? Have not all the exertions of those who wished well to science, and who tried their utmost to establish seminaries among you, proved unavailing, and can you not discover the real cause?

I know you say, the Lord does not seem to prosper your schools, which has been the fact from the days of Mr. Wesley, and which it is to be feared always will be with your present regulations.

In order to shut heresy out of the church, do you not shut out knowledge? Who among you read Unitarian or Universalist publications? And if any of your church members do read them, and speak of them in terms of approbation, are they not immediately suspected of heresy, and treated coolly? Is not the theological library at Newmarket watched with a jealous eye? A little work entitled **ERRORS OF METHODISM**, containing some friendly advice to those who are in the habit of disturbing their peaceable brethren by their **SHOUTS** in time of worship (although written by a *Wesleyan Methodist*,) could not peaceably remain. Was it not determined to exclude Priestly's discourses? You very justly complain of the illiberality of some of the Calvinists, but what would be thought of the professors at Andover, if they were to exclude from their library, Universalist, Unitarian, Arminian, or even Deistical books? Truth can never be in any real danger, for God is its author and supporter. Who has any thing to fear from storms, whose house is built on a rock? A man may well tremble if he stands on a sandy foundation, but it is to his own advantage to be made sensible of his danger. I shall endeavour in a future number to point out, in a tender manner as possible, some errors in your articles of faith.

ELIPHALET CASE.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—As nothing is a surer means of confuting the errors of mankind, than exposing them in their truly ridiculous light, I offer to your readers the following well authenticated account.

About the year 1818, there resided in France a gentleman of independent fortune. His family con-

sisted of two sons and a daughter. The latter, who is the subject of my story, was, when very young, taken over into England by a wealthy relation, and educated in the Protestant belief. In the course of time, the father, mother, and all the family fell victims to a hereditary disease. The young lady was recalled to France in order to claim her inheritance. The confessor of the family, together with his brother priests, were very much vexed, that a heretic should possess this large estate; and they feared lest they might lose the many benefits and emoluments they had obtained during the count's life-time. Every argument was therefore set at work, every art was tried, and every persuasion made use of to convert this *stray sheep* to the faith of her fathers. The young lady was successively waited upon by friars, monks, and even bishops; but she remained firm in her belief, and replied to their arguments with a judgment and discretion which showed she had not embraced her religion without due inquiry.

Wearied out at last with the incessant importunities of her friends and relations, one day, when the Bishop of N——s had argued for a long while with her, Holy Father, said she, I will consent to become a Catholic, if you will administer the sacrament to me, this very day. With pleasure, my child, says he; but you must go to the altar and receive it there. I had rather, replies the lady, avoid the disgrace of a public recantation of my errors, and if you will be good enough to sanctify this place, by virtue of the authority delegated to you by the holy church, and administer it here, I will show my gratitude by my donations to the church. This was the "*argumentum ad crumenas*." The bishop consented, and the young lady undertook to prepare the requisite materials. After the priest had sanctified the place and purified the room, as he was about placing the host upon his tongue, she asked him this question, Do you firmly believe, that your power as a minister of the gospel, and the words you have pronounced, have altered the nature of that wafer, that it is now really the *body* of Christ? Undoubtedly replies he, it is as much the body of our Saviour as there is a God. Then, if that be the case, it must possess a salutary and holy efficacy. Woman! exclaims the zealous bigot, 'tis sacrilege to doubt it. Then, if that be the case, archly replied our heroine, swallow it without fear, for though I have made the wafer of the most *deadly arsenic*, according to your doctrine the nature is entirely changed, and it will do you not only no hurt, but inconceivable good; but if your system be false, you will be a dead man in a minute. The astonished priest spit the holy wafer out of his mouth with the utmost loathing, immediately left the house, and never attempted to convert her again.

W. J.

MRS. JUDSON.

The wife of A. Judson, a famous missionary in the East Indies, sailed from Boston a short time since, where she had been, to visit her friends, and collect **MONEY** from the pious and charitable to aid her in distributing the bread of life to the poor hea-

then of Asia. A lady, who was in habits of familiar intercourse with Mrs. Judson, and to whom application was made for charity, in her behalf, informs us, that the *visiting dress* of this *self-denying* female missionary could not be valued at less than **TWELVE HUNDRED DOLLARS!!** The reader may be startled at the mention of such an enormous amount laid out in a *single* dress, to decorate the person of one whose affections are professedly set on heavenly things, and despising the vain and gaudy allurements of the world; it appeared to us incredible, till we heard from the lady some of the details. The Cashmere Shawl was valued at \$600; the Leghorn flat \$150; Lace trimming on the gown \$150, &c.; jewelry would soon make up the sum, leaving *necessary* articles of clothing out of the question. We hope the next edition of the missionary arithmetic, will inform us how many infants were robbed of their innocent, if not necessary, playthings; how many widows had denied themselves the use of sugar in tea, and butter on bread; how many poor debtors had robbed their creditors and labored without stockings and shoes, to furnish out this modern representative of the mystical Babylon.

N. E. Galaxy.

From the *Literary Magazine*, for 1804.

NATURE OF VIRTUE.

The celebrated Jonathan Edwards wrote a profound Treatise on the nature of true Virtue. The following anecdote from Joinville, the historian, of the last great expedition of the French to Syria and Egypt, before that of the present *imperator Gallorum*, will show that the same sentiment and doctrine may occur to the most dissimilar minds and in the most opposite situations.

Joinville says, "Friar Yves, of Brittany, being skilled in the language of the Saracens, was employed as interpreter between St. Louis and the Ambassadors for the King of Damascus. St. Louis was then in Acre, and the Ambassadors had come there to treat with him. The Friar, on passing between the King's lodging and that of the Ambassadors, was one day encountered in the street by a very aged woman, having in her right hand a pot of burning coals, and in her left a pitcher of water. "Woman, (said father Yves) what art thou about to do with these live coals in thine hand?" "To burn Paradise," answered she. "And what with the water?" "To extinguish the flames of hell!" Friar Yves then asked, how she could talk so? Her reply was, "That no person may do good in this world, to obtain a reward in Paradise; and that none may refrain from sin, for fear of the torments of hell; but that we may all do good, out of pure love to God, our Creator and Supreme Good!" Friar Yves, astonished at the woman's wisdom, passed on without reply.

This anecdote I find in the blank page of Edward's Treatise, and whether we consider it as a real incident, or merely as an apology, and the last is most probable—whether the old woman of Acre, or the old woman Joinville, was the advocate of this doctrine, it is a remarkable coincidence between

the great modern metaphysician and divine, and a hero of the crusades, which were undertaken for the express purpose of redeeming the souls of the adventurers from the punishment due to their crimes in a future world.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—By publishing the following, you will oblige a Subscriber.

FACTS RELATING TO THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY.

I. Trinitarians cannot produce a single Passage of the Bible, in which the Doctrine of the Trinity is stated, although it is very plainly defined in the Standards of the English and Scottish Establishments.

II. That learned and impartial Editor of the Greek Testament, Griesbach, himself a Trinitarian, rejects, from the 1st Epistle of St. John, (v. 7, 8,) the words, "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth." The Critical evidence upon which this passage is maintained to be spurious, is held to be satisfactory by the generality of competent judges, of all Churches. Many of the Theological Writers of the present day, though avowed Trinitarians, have expressed their belief in its spuriousness; among whom are Marsh, the Bishop of Peterborough,* Prettyman, the Bishop of Winchester,† Adam Clarke, the Wesleyan Methodist,‡ Charles Butler, the Roman Catholic,§ the Eclectic Reviewer,|| a Calvinist; and Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow; avoids this and the other supposed Trinitarian Passages that are affected by Griesbach's emendations, in his controversy with Mr. Yates.

III. Griesbach's reading, in Acts xx. 28, instead of *Church of God*, as in the English version, is, *Church of the Lord* (viz. Jesus).

IV. Griesbach's reading, 1 Tim. iii. 16, instead of *God* manifest in the flesh, is, *He* [i. e. Christ] who was manifested in the flesh.

V. Griesbach's reading, Rev. i. 8, is, *I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord God*, &c. and i. 11, the words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, and*, are omitted by him.

VI. The words printed in Italics in our Common Version, denote that there is nothing corresponding to them in the Original, e. g. the word *God*, Acts vii. 59, and 1 John iii. 16.

VII. Neither the word Trinity nor any equivalent word, nor the phrases, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, Eternal Son, Two Natures in Christ, Original Sin, Imputed Righteousness, Vicarious Sacrifice, or the Atoning Blood, occur in the Bible.

VIII. The Holy Spirit, as different from God the Father, is never, in the Bible, proposed as the object of Religious Worship.

IX. The Powers of Christ are never, in the Bible, referred to God the Son, but invariably to the Father or his Spirit.

* Trans. of Michaelis, Notes. † Elements of Christ. Theol. vol. ii. p. 90. ‡ Commentary on the passage. § Horæ Biblicæ. || Jan. 1809.

X. Our blessed Saviour, in his Solemn Prayer, recorded in the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel, declares the Father, to whom he is praying, (ver. 1, 5, &c.) to be *the only true God*, (ver. 3.) and with the same breath claims for himself only the character of *him whom the Father (the only true God) had sent*.

Let the serious inquirer examine attentively the following additional passages of the Bible: Deut. vi. 4, compared with Mark xii. 28; Isaiah xl. 18. xlv. 6. xlv. compared with John viii. 41-54, and Acts iv. 21-31; also, Mark xiii. 32; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

A FEW REFLECTIONS

ON AMBITION AND THE LOVE OF THE WORLD.

We presume no humble honest man, of any denomination, will deny that there exists in the human mind, in this mode of being, a predisposition ambitiously to desire pre-eminence, fame, and exaltation above their fellows. Men, generally, account that *sin*, which is, in their opinion, aggravatedly wicked. Not so the Scriptures. Every deviation from the commands and precepts of the Scripture, is *sin*. It is common to estimate the amount of the evil by the extent of its effects. Now the greatest good, which the community can enjoy, is harmony, friendship, brotherly affection, and the absence of pride, avarice, and ambition. It is our solemn conviction, that the present order of things, in the religious world, of elevating men, dignifying and pampering them, is one of the greatest evils the public is burdened with. For it has a tendency to generate feelings of spiritual pride, and religious animosity, hostile to the public good, view it in what shape you will.

Facts, and we are constrained to say, horrible facts, have proved, that no wretch, the most abandoned drunkard that ever existed, the most profane, the most blasphemous, atheistical and degraded man, ever manifested less *natural affection*, and more abominable indifference toward others, with the most atrocious cruelty, than has been avowed and practised by *dignified Christians*! By men, ambitious of spiritual exaltation, and holy pre-eminence over their fellows. The *blood of murdered millions* is our proof. The groans of the widow and the fatherless our testimony. The fact, that "God is good to *all*, and his tender mercies are over all his works," is sufficient to convince every reflecting mind, that man's benevolence should extend alike to all. Let it be remembered, that God made man upright, and that man sought out inventions. That God made man alike, without pre-eminence, and that man made dignities and titles, and usurped, an authority, pre-eminence, and distinction, which God never authorized nor approved. The religion of the world approves of these follies. The religion of Christ condemns them. For Christ says, "My kingdom is not of *this world*." Therefore, every distinction and emolument, not authorized by Christ, is a work of the *Devil*, and will be destroyed, and condemned, with his kingdom.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—On Sunday last I attended the Presbyterian Meeting-house at Morristown, (N. J.) and heard the Rev. Mr. Dewitt preach from the following words: "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." I must confess I was pleased with the first part of his sermon, and approve of his definition of the word holiness; with the exception of his broad assertion, that *man is totally depraved*. In his discourse, he asked, "Are *all* to be made holy?" He expressed doubts, and said, there were those who taught that *all* shall be made holy somehow or other at death, or after death. He then asked if the Scriptures contained any thing which supported that hypothesis? I think he answered No! But do we not read, "As the tree falls, so it shall lie; and he that is filthy, *shall* be filthy still?" I answer, No! The Bible contains no such doctrine.

My motive, Mr. Editor, in noticing this gentleman's discourse, is, to put the public on their guard, and to caution them, *how* they hear, and *what* they hear. I am of opinion that few persons would believe this reverend gentleman to be wicked enough to alter the Scriptures, or so ignorant as to mistake their contents. I would refer this gentleman for proof that *all* will be made holy, to Heb. viii. 8-12. Psa. lxxxvi. 9. Dan. ix. 24.

WATCHMAN.

Morristown, Aug. 14, 1823.

MISSIONARY IDEAS.

A late paper has started a new idea to favour the Missionary cause. It is this—Let a "*Grindstone*" be provided, in each populous town, to be called the "*Missionary Grindstone*," the crank to be turned by "*pious young men*;" and the pious of the community to keep them at work, by sending their penknives, scissors, razors, etc. to be ground, &c. It is conjectured a large sum could be raised, annually, and many "*pious young men*" be employed, who now are useless members of society.

SALVATION OF INFANTS.

Robert Robinson's inimitable Epitaph on four Infant Children, comprises, in a few words, the sum and substance of all that can be said on the subject.

EPITAPH IN HOUSTON CHURCH-YARD, NEAR CAMBRIDGE.

Bold Infidelity, turn pale and die;
Beneath this stone four Infant's ashes lie;
Say, are they lost or saved?
If Death's by sin, they sinn'd because they're here;
If Heaven's by works, in Heaven they can't appear:
Reason, ah, how depraved!
Revere the Sacred page—the knot's untied—
They died, for Adam sinn'd—they live, for Jesus died!

* * * City Subscribers are informed, that the Carrier, P. Lawrence, is authorized to receive their Subscriptions, and will receipt for the same. They will confer a favour by paying their Subscriptions on demand.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1823.

NO. 17.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—You will much oblige an inquirer after truth, by giving what you consider the *true scriptural* meaning of the following verses, in the 13th chapter of Luke, viz. 2, 3, 5, 23, 24, to the 30th inclusive. The 28th verse was the text from which the Rev. Mr. C. in Vandewater-street, preached last Sunday evening. In his sermon he drew a character of the Almighty, that, in my opinion, would almost *disgrace* the great enemy of mankind. No wonder that he said, "It was a subject on which he did not wish *often* to preach;" and that it was "a very *unpopular* one." He may rest assured that it is "unpopular," and will continue to be so.

Yours, &c. L. M.

New-York, Aug. 18, 1823.

REMARKS.

It is proper, first, to inform L. M. that the Rev. Mr. C. once published a book, entitled the "CHRISTIAN'S VADE-MECUM," which book contained a "Chapter on Baptism," in which, p. 188, it is declared, (by the Rev. Gentleman himself!) that the phrase, in the original, which is rendered *the kingdom of heaven*, "is adopted when it is manifest that the place of dominion suggested is *earth*, and not heaven; and that therefore the term can be understood only as a synonyma for" (the Rev. gentleman here made a mistake, and intended to say) *Theos*—God. By "*kingdom of God*," therefore, as used in Luke xiii. 28, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you *yourselves* thrust out," we are to understand the *Gospel dispensation*. For the Rev. Mr. C. says, *Vade-Mecum*, p. 188, "Accordingly 'the kingdom of heaven' is a *figurative* form of speech, which is used sometimes to denote the Gospel dispensation; in other instances, the reign, the dominion, the government, which God has established in the Christian church." Now we agree with the Rev. Mr. C. in this view of the subject. The 29th verse reads as follows—"And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God." *Quere*—Will they come from the east, &c. in another world? We consider the Jews were *first*, and the Gentiles *last*; but now, in the order of the Mediatorial kingdom, the Jews will be *last*, and the Gentiles are *first*.

L. M. requests our opinion of the "True Scriptural meaning of Luke xiii. 2, 3, 5; 23, 24," &c. We do not believe the warning, as it is considered, "Except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise* perish," can possibly have any relation or application to any

of Adam's race, since the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews, by their obstinacy, actually perished in the same manner, as did those on whom the tower of Siloam fell, &c.

The 23d to 30th verses inclusive, we consider to mean the following—That at the close of the Jewish economy, and when the door of types and shadows should be shut, that many Jews should strive to acquire the truth, and to enter into the kingdom of God; or, in other words, to see the reign of God, &c. That they should behold the Gentiles, whom they despised, favoured of God, and they themselves outcasts and wanderers. The Jews are now without, and continue, to this day, to knock at the door of types and shadows, but it is *shut*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—If you would have the goodness to reconcile the *apparent contradictions* in the following passages, viz. First Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, v. 9, with the 7, 8, 9, and 10th verses of 1st and 2d chapters of the Second Epistle of the same apostle, to the same people, you would very much oblige your sincere friend and reader, C. L. E.

New-York, Aug. 5, 1823.

REMARKS.


Our correspondent is requested to examine the connexion of the passages in question. Consider Paul to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the end of the Jewish rule and church. That Paul and his brethren in the faith, were not appointed unto *wrath*, but obtained a salvation by Christ, from all the sufferings which the Jews endured while their city was besieged and destroyed. Paul speaks of tribulation being recompensed to them who troubled or persecuted his brethren. The 2d chap. 2d Epistle Thessalonians, unquestionably is a brief account of what should take place during the time spoken of. The calling and appointing of Paul, and believers under the Mosaic dispensation, is plainly declared in Ephesians i. where the salvation of Paul, considered in the extensive view of God's purpose, is predicated on the fact, that it is God's good pleasure to gather *all* in Christ.

It is indispensable to a correct understanding of Paul's epistles, that we should bear in mind, that he wrote them *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, while the temple was standing in that city, and at the very time when the Jews worshipped in its courts, and sacrificed upon its altars. (See 1 Thess. ii. 14-16.) The kingdom of Christ considered as the introduction of the Gospel, in contradistinction to the Jewish economy, was yet to come. Paul views the subject thus, in 2d Epist. Thess. i. 4-10.

We see the declaration of Paul, so far as it relates to the punishment *from the presence* of the Lord, verified in our day. The Jews are a standing evidence of the truth of the testimony.

It is also important to consider, that the Jews who were appointed unto *wrath*, were designated by a God of love, and to consummate a merciful purpose. The same apostle, speaking of this people, in Rom. xi. 23-32, says, "As concerning the *gospel* [if you please, God's method of salvation, they are now treated as] enemies for your [the Gentiles] sakes; but as touching the election, *they are* beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the gifts and calling of God *are* without repentance. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief, even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."

It appears from the above testimony, that the Jews, although *beloved* of God, and by him concluded in unbelief that he might have mercy on them, were not appointed to salvation as Paul was, but were the subjects of wrath, because God's wrath was revealed against their principles and practices.

 We insert the following at the particular request of the Rev. Mr. W. Roy.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

REVEREND WILLIAM ROY.

Respected Sir—When you shall have looked at the contents of this sheet, I hope you will excuse me for troubling you on this occasion: I have been endeavouring for more than a week to get at that number of the Gospel Herald which contains Mr. J. Ditchett's last, and very erroneous remarks on your Discourse of the 15th of June; but did not succeed until Saturday last. He commences his commentary on your witnesses, by very insidiously remarking, that we put the Col "to Mr. Peter Sythoff's name, in order to give the more validity to his testimony." But I am warranted in saying, that he could not have had any such impression, for it was most satisfactorily proven to him, when at Newark last, that it was altogether a mistake on our part, and that there was not the least design in so doing. He further states, that Mr. S. charged you in his (that is Ditchett's) presence, with the same gross assertions. This is another palpable and designing falsehood. For to my knowledge, Mr. S. had not the least objection to any part of the Discourse, unless what you said relative to Atheists, Deists and Universalists, &c. &c. And as for Mr. Sythoff's ever saying that he was drawn into the business in a hurry, and that he was sorry he had signed your paper, that is equally false.

But I must acknowledge that I felt somewhat shocked, when I read in the Herald that Sheriff Reynolds requested Ditchett to use his name, as a warrant for the above-stated recantation of Mr. S., for from the well-known and acknowledged veracity of Mr. Reynolds, I was conscious that such testimony coming through the medium of him, must

necessarily militate against your cause. I therefore this morning sought and obtained an interview with the Sheriff, and he absolutely denied making any such communication to Mr. Ditchett, and observed that Mr. Sythoff did not tell him that he regretted signing his name, &c. But I would now ask Mr. Ditchett, if he has not sufficiently manifested the impotency of his cause, by adducing such far-fetched testimony? Why does he refer to the Sheriff for what Mr. S. has said? He had a long interview with Mr. Sythoff himself, and if Sythoff had said any thing in the least favourable to his cause, would he not have embraced it with the greatest avidity, and given it to the public through the Herald? Most certainly he would; but the fact is just this—A little previous to his conversation with Mr. Sythoff, at Bonnel's tavern, he remarked in my hearing that he had heard that Mr. S. was sorry that he had subscribed. Sythoff entering the room shortly after, I immediately related to him what Ditchett had said; when he turned indignantly to D. . . . and said, No, Sir, I am not sorry, nor did I sign my name until I had twice read Mr. Roy's paper. I have since conversed with Mr. S. upon the subject, and he says he will cheerfully give you his affidavit, to what he has signed, &c. This you may conclude, does not look much like a recantation on his part.

As for Mr. D.'s most scandalous attack upon the judgment and memory of the afflicted James C. Ogden, it is almost without a precedent. Mr. Ogden is a man of a sound mind and a retentive memory, and bears an unblemished character. To the best of my knowledge, I shall now briefly notice, what, in my opinion, puts the pinnacle on his infamous climax—viz. his stating that *I had asserted* that the paper which I signed read different from the one you published;—and likewise, that I had added the last part of your third objection. I do assure you, Sir, that I never suggested such an idea. Mr. Ditchett asked me, in the presence of several persons, if I wrote your publication. I immediately put a negative to his interrogatory, and there was no more said on the subject.

And now to conclude, I must remark, that there is but *one* essential truth in all his last communication, and that is this, he says Mr. Rhode is not inclined to contradict himself. I went to see Mr. Rhode, on Saturday, and took with me the Herald, and I verily thought that Mr. D. was correct; for Mr. Rhode says, that so far is he from contradicting himself, that he will make oath before any Justice of the Peace, to the full amount of what he has subscribed, at any time, if you think it will be of service to you. And as Mr. D. acknowledges Rhode to be a man of veracity, perhaps his testimony coming under oath, will be received as bearing some weight with the friends of Ditchett.

Respectfully yours,

W. H. HYATT.

Newark, August 25, 1823.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Brother Fitz—I was much pleased with some remarks of your correspondent, U. C. F. It is much

to be regretted that severity should in any case be necessary among brethren. The conduct, however, of some who have assumed the clerical character, is extremely reprehensible, and I conceive it to be the duty of every honest man to raise his voice against their unchristian conduct.

Timid minds may shrink—those possessing delicate feelings may be disposed to heal the hurt slightly,—but to oppose the current of abuse successfully, energy, decision, and even severity, will be found necessary. Your correspondent speaks of “Doctor S.’s people.” Now I think, that “the earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof.” The church is called, “God’s heritage;” and what right the Doctor has to lord it over them, I know not. I should like to know the difference, in fact, between the Catholic priest, who receives from the hand of the starving peasant his poor pittance, and the Protestant clergyman, who lives in luxury upon what properly belongs to the poor and destitute! That this is sometimes the case, facts will abundantly testify. Many in this city who are contributing largely to, what is called, religious purposes, are unable to pay their debts. Others are living in penury, and almost destitute of the necessities of life; while their pastors and their families are indulging in all the fashionable follies of the day. “Surely these things ought not to be.”

It is perfectly just, that the pastor should be remunerated for his time; but that he should receive twice as much as he can earn in any other calling is unjust. It may appear plausible enough to talk of a fair bargain; but it is well known to those conversant with the affairs of churches, that the lower classes have but little influence in such bargains, and their opinions are but little regarded. These affairs are generally managed by a few individuals, who are more intent on parade and popularity, than the temporal good of their poor brethren. I trust the pages of the G. H. will never be devoted to promote the schemes of ambitious and interested individuals, like the time-serving publications of the day; but with fearless independence expose those deep-rooted conceptions which threaten to destroy the power of Godliness from among us, and leave nothing but empty show.

Should any Calvinist find a teacher of Universal salvation, acting in opposition to cardinal principles, I think he will be in duty bound to point it out in language plain enough to be understood.

Yours truly.

A FRIEND TO CONSISTENCY.

New-York, Aug. 1823.

N. B. An enemy is less dangerous than a flatterer.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I attended a conference not long since in this place, by the Baptists. I could not expect any thing very inviting. However, after sitting some time, the young preacher arose and addressed his brethren in a very friendly manner, after reading a chapter to convince them they had not come to Mount Sinai, but Mount Sion, the city of the living

God. After speaking some time about the judgments upon Rochester, having reference to the many recent deaths in this place, he then, in order to have a small Mount Sinai, declared, that he had not the least reason to doubt that a man who died in this village lately, had made his bed in hell; awful, he says, to relate. I agree with him; but the question is, How should he know this?

I have one question to ask—Will a man be damned for not believing that which he cannot understand? I ask, Did ever a man understand that all mankind were made liable to endless misery, and yet some of those that were made liable, were elected to everlasting life? This looks to me like the mystery of iniquity.

Conversing with a Baptist brother, not long since, on asking him if “the Lord was good to all, and his tender mercies over all his works;” he replied, certainly he is. I asked him, If his tender mercies were over those he made endlessly miserable? He would not give me a direct answer; but said, it is for the glory of God. Now, if this is for the glory of God, would it be for his glory to make all happy?

C. S. B.

Rochester, Monroe Co. (N. Y.) July 1823.

CALVINISM vs. UNIVERSALISM,

OR CAUSE AND EFFECT ILLUSTRATED.—

Or the cause of Drunkenness proved and defended, &c.

Our last Number contained what the Connecticut Calvinists, who figure in the (New-Haven) “Religious Intelligencer,” call “Effects of Universalism.” Now we like to see things called by their right names. We are disposed to a dispassionate inquiry into, and illustration of, the charge there brought against the doctrine of Universal salvation. We want the public to judge in this case. We excuse the Calvinist for his slander, not because his slander was, according to his doctrine, foreordained, but because we believe he is under the almost uncontrollable influence of the devil, the father of lies. We pity the subjects of the kingdom of darkness, and rejoice that a day of deliverance awaits them, when their captivity shall be led away captive, and they receive the gifts of love and honesty.

This Calvinist will have it, that the fact of the licentious tendency of the doctrine of Universal salvation is so notorious, that “where a poor intemperate, profane creature is seen wallowing in his pollution, that it is frequently asked: Is he not a Universalist? So on the other hand, if it is observed that such a man has become a Universalist, it is inquired, Has he not become a drunkard too?” &c. Although the premises are as false as any lie can be, we shall accommodate this Calvinist, for once, by admitting the supposition that he has told the truth. What then is the result? Why, this Calvinist rejects the faith and principles of the believer in the salvation of all men, and his own principles and doctrines must furnish evidence and arguments to prove and illustrate the subject! So be it. What are the premises, according to this Calvinist? Ans. Facts, notorious facts, prove, that when a man be-

comes a *Universalist*, he also, of necessity, "becomes a *drunkard too!*" How does this happen? Why, here are *cause* and *effect*. The cause of the *drunkenness*, is the belief of the salvation of *all men** the cause of this belief is, what?

This will not answer. If our encomiast was an *Arminian*, the case would be altered; as it is, we shall keep him to his principles, and make him accountable for the conclusions which flow from his own premises. Well, what are a Calvinist's premises? Ans. "God hath *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass." What is the *foreordination* of the Calvinist's creed? Ans. "The *decrees* of God are his *eternal purpose*, whereby, for his own glory, he hath *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass." Does it come to pass that "men become *Universalists*?" O, yes. How does it happen? Ans. It was the "*eternal purpose* of God" that they should be so; therefore he "*decreed*, or *foreordained*" it. Does it come to pass that *Universalists* "become *drunkards*?" This is a "*notorious fact!*" How does this happen? Why, it was the "*eternal purpose* of God" that *Universalists* should "become *drunkards*," therefore it was *decreed*, or *foreordained!*"

Now we, (although on the authority of a *sober* Calvinist, are drunken *Universalists*,) shall enter our protest against all evasion of conclusions which flow from a Calvinist's premises. And we appeal to all the *sober* men in the world, and ask, Does it not follow, of necessity, from the Calvinist's creed, and premises, that the *drunkenness* of *Universalists*, so far from being the *effect* of their principles, is the effect of God's "*eternal purpose*, whereby he hath *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass?" Can any thing be more conclusive? Look at the premises. It comes to pass that *Universalists* get drunk. God *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass. Therefore, God as certainly *foreordained* the drunkenness of *Universalists*, as the drunkenness of *Universalists* comes to pass. Prove the principle. God *never* *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass. The drunkenness of *Universalists* comes to pass. Therefore, God *never* *foreordained* the drunkenness of *Universalists*. Reader, the deductions of reason are as infallible as truth itself. "It is impossible for a thing to be and not to be at the same time."

We will now consider the necessity for this drunkenness, according to this Calvinist's premises. It must be conceded, that God decreed the happening of *necessary*, or *unnecessary*, and therefore injurious and useless, events. The certainty of the event taking place, depends upon the *will* and *power* of the being who *foreordains* the event. The *will* of the being who *foreordains* the event, must be governed by the *utility* or advantages which are to arise from the happening of the event; or from the *inutility* and *evil* that the event will occasion; or from sheer *caprice*. The *power* of the being, de-

pends upon his constitution and independence. God is declared to be self-existent. Of *all-mighty* power. Now it must be admitted, that the drunkenness of *Universalists* is *pleasing* to God, or *displeasing* to him. If *pleasing* to God, a reason can be assigned for his *foreordaining* it, and making the *pleasing* event *certain*. If *displeasing*, no reason can be assigned for God's *decree*, unless you admit the absurdity, that God employs his omnipotent energies against himself.

Again. "GOD IS LOVE." (So says the Scripture.) If God is LOVE, then his decrees must be consistent with *love*, and he must *foreordain* every event from the impulse and exercise of *love*. Consequently, it follows that, if God *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass, he *foreordained* the drunkenness of *Universalists*, if the drunkenness of *Universalists* comes to pass. And if "GOD IS LOVE," he *foreordained* it in *love*, and it follows, that it is a *lovely thing to get drunk!!!*

Reader—Is drunkenness the *effect* of the doctrine of the salvation of *all men*; or is it the effect of *Calvinism*?

Now, be it known unto all men, that we enter our SOLEMN PROTEST against the *abominable* premises, and the *wicked* conclusions of Calvinism. We pity the man who could write and utter the slander we have noticed. We are ashamed of those whose sectarian prejudices could so far get the better of their understanding and conscience, as to publish to the world, and countenance this vile production; which is an outrageous denial of the every day's experience and observation of an enlightened public. It is a disgrace to our country, and to the press. It is a satire upon the character and principles of every professor of Christianity, who tolerates with pecuniary support, or by any countenance whatever, the paper which ushered this bantling of ecclesiastical spleen into being, and poisoned the atmosphere of Christendom with the pestiferous effluvia of high-handed slander, and unparalleled falsehood.

"O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel."

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

(LETTER 2.)

Bellingham, —, 1823.

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dear Brethren—In my last I stated, that I should point out to you what I considered exceptionable in your articles of faith; which I now proceed to do in as tender a manner as the nature of the subject will permit. I commence with the doctrine of the TRINITY; not, however, because I think, in itself considered, it is of any great importance; but because I conscientiously think it is the foundation, on which is built the superstructure of *vicarious atonement*, the *infinite evil of sin*, *total depravity*, *endless misery*, and finally, *all the absurdities of orthodoxy*. I know very well that it is a hackneyed subject; and

* This principle is proved to be true by its application. Every man, for-sooth, who believes in the endless misery of a large portion of mankind, is sober; and possesses, of necessity, as a consequence of his faith, a mortal antipathy to RUM! When you see a man drunk, you know his sentiments! No Calvinist ever gets drunk. Noah got drunk; ergo, NOAH was a UNIVERSALIST!!!

that all has been said for and against it, that learning, experience, and ingenuity could invent. I know also that you have very little charity for *Unitarians as Christians*: and that rejecting the doctrine of the TRINITY, will be sufficient, in your estimation, to brand me, not only with heresy, but infidelity itself. I have not the vanity to think that my views respecting the doctrine in question, are infallibly correct; but this I can say, they have been formed from a careful examination of the sacred writings; and that if the Scriptures and my reason lead me astray, there is no remedy; for I will suffer no man to think for me—I will believe nothing implicitly.

I suppose all the arguments by which *Trinitarians* endeavour to prove that Christ is Jehovah, are grounded on the three following propositions: 1. He is the Creator and preserver of the universe. 2. He is called God by the sacred writers. 3. He is the object of religious worship. The above propositions I shall notice in as brief a manner as possible. 1. He is the Creator, &c. Let me direct your attention to Proverbs viii. 22. to the 30th verse inclusive; where Solomon personifies Wisdom, and makes it speak the following language: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. When there was no depth, I was brought forth; when there was no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled; before the hills were brought forth. While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the deep: when he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: when he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth. Then was I by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." Now turn to St. John's Gospel i. 1, 2, 3, "In the beginning was the Word (or Logos, literally, wisdom) and the word (Wisdom) was with God and the Word (Wisdom) was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, (it, Wisdom) and without him (it Wisdom) was not any thing made that was made." It will not be denied that the Rabbins and Greek philosophers used the term Logos, to designate Wisdom; and it can make no difference with which it was original, as they used it in the same sense. Now observe, Solomon makes Wisdom say, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning;" and St. John says, "In the beginning was the Word" (Wisdom.) Judge ye: Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that Solomon and St. John speak of the same thing; and that it is simply an attribute of the Deity of which they speak; instead of being a second person in a TRINITY of Gods? The apostle says, "In him (Christ) dwell all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Wisdom being that attribute of the Deity by which he created and rules the universe, and by which the

work of reconciliation was commenced, is going on, and finally will be consummated, is very properly called the fulness of the Godhead; and I cannot but think a mind destitute of prejudice or prepossessions, would immediately perceive that Logos, Word, Wisdom and fulness of the Godhead, mean the same thing, and are used to express that attribute of the Deity by which he is directed in all his works. God created all things by the Logos it is true; but must we infer from hence that the *man Christ Jesus* created all things? Certainly not; for he had no personal existence till some thousand years after the worlds were made. An eternal principle dwelt in Christ, which St. John calls the word, and which the apostle calls the fulness of the Godhead; and it is, probably, to this principle that he himself alludes when he says, "It is not I that do the works; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." I think it will appear obvious, from the above remarks, that God created the universe by Wisdom; and that the *man Christ Jesus* had nothing to do with creation; and that he never existed till he was conceived by Mary.

2. It is said that Christ is called God by the inspired writers. Much stress has been laid on Isa. ix. 6, "For unto us a child is born," &c. It is strange how any one, who had the least knowledge of the highly figurative language of the Orientals, should have imagined that this *verse* proved that Christ was the eternal Jehovah. If they had asked themselves, who should be called the everlasting Father, the answer would have been obvious;—a child. Would the prophet have insulted Jehovah by saying that he should be born, and by giving him the title of prince, counsellor, wonderful, &c. and by calling him a CHILD? David says in the 2d Psalm; "I have said ye are gods;" and Jesus says, "If they were called Gods;" and the apostle, "there are gods many and lords many, but unto us there is one God and one Lord Jesus Christ." Names do not alter things; and whatever Christ might have been called, it is plain that "he was tempted in all points as we are;" and that he was ignorant of the time when Jerusalem was to be destroyed; and that he ate and drank, slept and awoke, lived and died like other men, with the exception of error; guile not being found in his lips. Do you think that Jehovah was tempted as we are? Did he eat, drink, sleep, and die? If Jehovah did not; and Jesus Christ did, then Jesus Christ is not Jehovah, whether he be called so or not. Moses said to the Jews, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up, like unto me." If Christ be Jehovah, how could Moses have the impudence to say he should be like him? Did he compare the Almighty to himself? Does this look like the meekness of Moses? I think not.

3. It is said that Christ is the object of religious worship. Religious worship does not consist in bodily exercise, nor in a mixture of awe and wonder; but in a spiritual communion of a soul with its Maker; and in a subordinate sense, with other objects of its affection and gratitude. We love, adore, or worship God supremely, because he first loved us,

and is the author of our enjoyments; and we love Christ with the same love, but not in the same degree. We are commanded to love our neighbour; but it is not idolatry to love him in a subordinate sense. If we do not love our brother whom we have seen, how can we love God whom we have not seen? We ought to love Christ as the immediate author, under God, of our holy religion, but Jehovah alone is worthy of our supreme adoration. I have thus briefly noticed the three propositions on which are grounded the principal arguments for the divinity of Christ; and if others cannot see as I do, I shall not condemn them as heretics.

As to the third person in the TRINITY, it appears to me to be nothing more nor less than TRUTH, and the operation of the Divine energy or power. The latter seems to be meant in the first of Genesis, where it is said that "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters;" and in Luke i. 35, where it is said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" but the former is generally meant. TRUTH being a holy principle, is very properly denominated the *Holy Spirit*, or Spirit of God. St. John explains this subject and places it beyond a doubt. See his first general Epistle, iv. 1, 2, 3, "Beloved believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God (or God's Spirits) because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know we the spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, and this is the spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now is it in the world." Those who confess that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, were guided by the *Truth, Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God*; and those who denied it were not of God, but were lying spirits, spirits of darkness or antichrist. I have thus given you my views of the doctrine of the TRINITY, which doctrine I verily think one of the most palpable absurdities ever invented by priests, or believed by rational beings. The nature of this communication would not permit me to say more. It is a little over a year since I began to doubt its truth; soon after which I read with care, Elder Hedding's sermon on the divinity of Christ; which was published at the request of the N.E. Conference assembled at Bath, Me. 1822, and although I feel as much respect for his candor and abilities as I do for any man's living, and although I believe he has said all that can be said to prove that the Son is equal to the Father, and not only equal, but the Father himself; yet I must confess he has not removed my objections to the TRINITY. His sermon served to increase and confirm my doubts; and I cannot think it can satisfy any candid inquirer after truth, whose mind is not blinded by early prejudices. The doctrine of the TRINITY is acknowledged on all hands to be an incomprehensible *mystery*; and it is certain that it is contrary to every thing we see in nature, and can only be supported by a few ambiguous texts of scripture, in opposition to a multitude that are plain and ex-

PLICIT. God is expressly called Love, Power, &c. and by the same rule that wisdom is made a separate person, all his attributes might be; and then we should have as many persons in the Godhead as the Deity has attributes. Moses said, "the Lord your God is one God;" but if he had been a Trinitarian, he would have said, the Lord your God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is one God. I cannot close without observing that you place too much emphasis on the word TRINITY, for if a man will but believe it in any form it will answer the purpose, and take away the reproach of infidelity. I think I shall be able in my next to close my objections to your creed.

Yours in love, E. CASE.

CLARKE'S COMMENTARY.

It is not perhaps generally known, that the celebrated Dr. Adam Clarke, got the better of his prejudices so far, as, in his commentary on Matt. xvi. 27, 28, to admit that Christ came, as there declared, during the generation or natural lives of those he addressed on that memorable occasion. The learned Doctor has made a concession in favour of the truth, which militates against his own favourite doctrine, which cannot be supported without a rejection of this, the Doctor's own exposition. The Doctor's exposition follows, and the reader can see for himself.

"27 For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.

"28 Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Verse 27. *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father*] This seems to refer to Dan. vii. 13, 14. "Behold one like the Son of man came—to the ancient of days—and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and nations and languages should serve him." This was the glorious Mediatorial kingdom which Jesus Christ was now about to set up, by the destruction of the Jewish nation and polity, and the diffusion of his Gospel through the whole world. If the words be taken in this sense, the *angels* or messengers may signify the apostles and successors in the sacred ministry, preaching the Gospel in the power of the Holy Ghost. It is very likely that the words do not apply to the final judgment, to which they are generally referred; but to the wonderful display of God's grace and power after the day of Pentecost.

Verse 28. *There be some—which shall not taste of death*] This verse seems to confirm the above explanation, as our Lord evidently speaks of the establishment of the Christian Church after the day of Pentecost, and its final triumph after the destruction of the Jewish polity; as if he had said, "Some of you, my disciples, shall continue to live until these things take place." The destruction of Jerusalem, and the Jewish æconomy, which our Lord here predicts, took place about forty-three years after this; and some of the persons now with

him, doubtless survived that period, and witnessed the extension of the Messiah's kingdom; and our Lord told them these things before, that when they came to pass they might be confirmed in the faith, and expect an exact fulfilment of all the other promises and prophecies which concerned the extension and support of the kingdom of Christ.

To his kingdom, or in his kingdom, Instead of *Basilæa, kingdom*, four MSS. later *Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Saxon*, and one copy of the *Itala*, with several of the primitive Fathers, read *doxe, glory*: and to this is added, *lou patros autou, of his Father*, by three MSS. and the versions mentioned before. This makes the passage a little more conformable to the passage already quoted from Daniel: and it must appear very clearly, that the whole passage speaks not of a future judgment, but of the destruction of the Jewish polity; and the glorious spread of Christianity in the earth, by the preaching of *Christ crucified* by the Apostles and their immediate successors in the Christian Church.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

ANECDOTE.

THE SOLDIER AND THE VIRGIN MARY.

During the Peninsular war, a strong detachment from the French army occupied one of the principal cities in the interior of Spain. The Spaniards have long been celebrated for their blind and superstitious adoration of the *Virgin Mary*. The inhabitants of this place, in particular, were noted for their many statues, dedicated to her in all their churches. The cathedral exceeded all others in the size of the image, the splendor of the robes, the jewels and precious stones, the votive offerings of misguided zeal. Every part of the image was studded with *diamonds* and adorned with gold. A French soldier was noted for his devotions, his constant and unremitting attention at the earliest and latest mass. He was one day accidentally left alone in the church, after the first mass had concluded, by the priest and sexton. He immediately seized the opportunity of converting the jewels of the sacred image to his own use, and so completely did he strip her, that when the monks returned they found her *hands and feet* broken off, her *eyes* dug out, and not the value of a single sous left.

This horrid and impious sacrilege aroused all the vengeance of the offended church. Immense rewards were offered, and every means were used to discover the offender. They at length succeeded in proving that this soldier was the only person who had committed the crime. A deputation immediately waited upon the commander in chief, requesting this culprit to be delivered over to the secular power. General N——, who was one of the illuminati of France, and possessed of liberal principles, refused to deliver this man to an enraged rabble, who would undoubtedly put him to death without the shadow of a trial. He replied, that he would try the soldier by a military and ecclesiastical tribunal, would decide the cause himself, and if he was proved guilty, he would then, without hesitation, surrender him; and appointed the next week for

the hearing of the cause. This proceeding was by no means pleasant to the irritated Catholics, but they had no remedy but patience. On the appointed day, all the clergy of the city, and every adjacent place assembled in crowds, the court was filled with monks, friars, priests, bishops, archbishops, and even the pope's legate, who happened to be there at the time, appeared among the ecclesiastics. The populace, also, eager to witness the punishment of so audacious a heretic, and ready to sacrifice him, surrounded the place in crowds. But the General had taken the precaution to surround himself and the prisoner with a strong detachment. A reverend priest addressed the court, and descanted at large upon the enormity of the offence; he represented to them the *holy mother of God* as insulted, ill-treated, and sacrilegiously violated; and finally wound them up to the highest pitch of fury against the devoted offender. His oration was received by the bigoted enthusiasts with thunders of applause, and imprecations of vengeance; already they saw him tied to the stake and expiring in tortures at an *Auto da fe*. But the judge, cool, collected, and temperate, turning round to the man, asked him, You have heard the charge, what is your defence? That I have taken the jewels and diamonds from the Holy Virgin's Statue, I admit; but I positively deny that I *robbed her* of them. As I was praying to her, and begging her interposition in my behalf, as a poor and *needy* soldier, with a family of six children and nothing but my scanty pittance to support them, I suddenly heard a voice from the statue exclaim—"The Holy Virgin has heard your prayers, she has seen your devotion, and pities your lot. Take these jewels and other ornaments which the piety of my worshippers have presented me with, and relieve your necessities. I am a *spirit*, and need them not. My faithful followers will soon replace them, and you will be rescued from want and misery." Astonished at this heavenly voice, and not daring to disobey it, I converted them to my own use, and blessed the friendly interposition of our blessed Virgin.

Abominable liar! audacious wretch! exclaimed the assembly. The judge ordered silence, and turning to the priests of the cathedral, thus addressed them—Was any one *present* at this time? No one, replied they. Do you believe it *possible*, according to your articles of faith, that the Virgin has *power* to convey her will in an *audible* manner, and to animate an image? This was a question involving the miraculous power and sanctity of the Holy mother; and to deny it, would at once overthrow her power and reduce her to the level of a mere mortal. They, therefore, with some hesitation, answered, that it was not only *possible*, but had frequently happened. Then I decree, as the man swears that the Sacred Virgin *gave* these things to him, and you cannot disprove his assertion, that the man is hereby acquitted of the charge; but, addressing himself to the soldier, if you hereafter accept any *present*, unless before witnesses, from any saint or apostle, even if from the holy St. Paul himself, I will instantly hang you. W. J.

ROCK HONEY.

"He made him to suck honey out of the rock."

Deut. xxxii. 12.

Suck honey from a rock! How could this possibly be done? In South Africa, the bees have the habit of depositing, or plastering their honey on the surface of rocks in cliffs; which, for its protection, they cover over with a layer of dark coloured wax. This, by exposure to the weather, becomes hard, and of a colour which cannot be distinguished from rock itself. Suppose a person making an incision in this outside coat of wax; by applying his mouth to it, he would easily succeed in sucking out plenty of honey. To a person viewing him from a little distance, and observing some of the honey dropping from his chin, he would seem to be sucking honey from the flinty rock.

The bees frequently cover trees in the same manner, with their honey and wax. I have seen also the gable end of a Dutch farmer's house plastered over in the same manner. It proved to him a perpetual mine of honey; for he had no sooner cut and carried away a portion of it for the use of his family, than the busy bees set to work to fill up the excavation he had made. As his necessity required continued supply, he kept them constantly at work. They are most expeditious workers in winter, for that is the flower season in such climates.

Rev. J. Campbell.

BLESSED EFFECTS OF MISSIONARIES.

The Philadelphia Religious Remembrancer contains an extract from a journal of a missionary in India, giving an account of a "mutiny of women against the missionaries." It appears the women remonstrated with the king, against allowing the missionaries to remain in the country, &c.—"Four of the principal women were put to death with the soldier's bayonets." The king of course, was thanked! For the missionary says, "We thanked him for his *gracious* promises of regard and protection!" Is it the religion of Calvin, or of Jesus, that produces this bloodshed? If the spirit of Christ had been there, we think, a different result would have happened.

The same paper gives an account of Calvinism raining from the clouds, as follows:

"It was during the early part of September, 1822, that appearances in *Westfield* indicated a shower of grace. There was indeed a sprinkling, and a few we hope, were saved, but the heavenly cloud passed along *northwardly* and stood over *Southampton*, raining righteousness upon that highly favoured people, and with such power that it was indeed a season when Zion's gates were crowded with trembling and anxious, and rejoicing souls. The work continued in this place in its greatest power through the autumn and winter."

The moderns are certainly wonderful in description. We fear the cloud rained from beneath, instead of from above. The use made of natural things as figures, in the Scriptures, are inclusive of God's purpose toward *all*, and not to a few bigoted sectarians.

"Awful Warning to" Psalm singers!!

The Congregational meeting house in Southwick, Massachusetts, together with a two-story dwelling house adjoining, was lately destroyed by fire. A singing society held their meeting in the meeting-house, where the fire originated, and it was supposed to have been communicated from the spark of a candle.

Bost. Rec.



NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Our Subscribers who are yet in arrears for the *Third Volume* of the GOSPEL HERALD, are informed, that the sums owed by them respectively, have been advanced by the Proprietors of the Paper, to defray the expenses of publishing, &c. and it is confidently hoped, that this notice of the fact, will be a sufficient inducement with them to forward the amount of their subscriptions, without any unnecessary delay. There is now due from Subscribers \$1400; a sum which is by far too large to be kept from the Proprietors of the Paper, who have advanced their own means, in default of others to fulfil their engagements. It is presumed our Subscribers are not aware of the inconveniences which result from their negligence. Neither do they consider that the Proprietors have no motives but in common with their Brethren, to disseminate the glorious Gospel of Christ, and to lessen the evils which error has generated and perpetuated. The object, then, being *one*, the exertions and means of all concerned, should be *one* also.

* * The Conditions of this Paper, necessarily being payment in *advance*, as many are requested to settle their Subscriptions for the *Fourth Volume*, as can do it without inconvenience.

NOTICE.

The Members of the "Second Society of United Christian Friends," in this city, are informed, that a special Meeting will be held on Tuesday evening next, (Sept. 9th.) at 7 o'clock, at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, No. 63 Chrystie-street. The attendance of every member is particularly requested.

We are requested to give notice, that the editor of this paper will visit Morristown, (N. J.) a week from tomorrow, Sunday, Sept. 13, &c.

KNEELAND'S TESTAMENT.

For Sale at this Office, The New Testament, in Greek, Greek and English, and English. The Greek according to Griesbach; the English upon the basis of the fourth London edition of the Improved Version, with an attempt to farther improvement from the translations of Campbell, Wakefield, Scarlett, Macknight, and Thompson. By Abner Kneeland, Minister of the First Independent Church of Christ, called Universalist, in Philadelphia. The Greek and English in 2 vols. Price—Greek, \$3. Greek and English, \$4. Do. in calf, \$4 50, English, \$1 50. Do. in calf, \$1 75.

ALSO, FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE,

Ballou's Notes on the Parables.—Ballou on Atonement.—Ballou's Eleven Sermons.—Discourse delivered at the Installation of David Pickering, by J. Bisbe, Jun.—Discourse by D. Pickering, on the Doctrine of St. Paul.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1823.

NO. 18.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

(LETTER 3.)

Bellingham, ———, 1823.

TO THE MINISTERS AND MEMBERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Dear Brethren—In my last, I gave you my views of the doctrine of the Trinity: I now proceed to examine other dogmas of your church, which I consider equally erroneous; and which I think are so intimately connected with the above named doctrine, that they cannot be supported without it. I shall first make some remarks on infinite and vicarious atonement, and the infinite evil of sin. 2d. I shall examine the UNMERCIFUL doctrine of ENDLESS MISERY. When the doctrine of the Trinity had once become a popular doctrine of the Christian church, and was established as an article of faith, each person in the Godhead had a particular character assigned him. The Father was a monarch, full of *justice and vengeance*: The Son was the creator, full of *mercy and love*: The Holy Ghost proceeded from both Father and Son, and seemed to partake of the nature of both; and his office was to obey them, and execute their designs. When it was admitted that the Son was co-equal and co-eternal with the Father, and as occasion required, the Father himself, and that he died to atone for the sins, original and actual, of the whole world, and suffered for and instead of mankind, it followed that the atonement was both infinite and vicarious. The doctrine of the infinite evil of sin, probably grew out of infinite atonement. If the atonement had been considered infinite, one would have borne no proportion to the other; and theologians in order to keep up a show of consistency, affirmed that sin was an infinite evil, because it was committed against an infinite being. I know of but one preacher, however, in your church, the Rev. T. M. who believes the Deity suffered in the work of redemption, although it seems impossible, consistently, to avoid such a belief, if Christ died; and Christ be the Deity as you affirm. We cannot believe that God suffered, because suffering implies imperfection. If only a finite being suffered, the atonement could not be infinite. God could not suffer; and if an atonement was made, it was made by a finite being, therefore the atonement was not infinite; and if mankind suffer for the sins which they commit, the atonement is not vicarious—mankind do suffer for their sins, therefore the atonement is neither infinite nor vicarious. The argument that sin is infinite, because it is committed against an infinite law, or an infinite Being, is so silly that a child ought to be ashamed of it. By the

same reasoning we should say all our acts are infinite, as they all have a reference to God some way or other; they being all consistent with, or contrary to the eternal rule of right. No finite being can do an infinite act—man is finite, sin is an act of his, therefore sin is not infinite. This brings me, secondly, to an examination of the doctrine of *endless misery*.

If I were to admit the doctrine of infinite and vicarious atonement with the infinite evil of sin, I could not avoid the doctrine of Universalism; for if sin were an infinite evil, and the atonement were infinite and vicarious, if Christ died for, and instead of the transgressor, and answered the demands of the law for, and in his stead, why does he stand in jeopardy every hour? Is he not safe? I will not however take the advantage of an absurdity, believed by an opponent, to refute another absurdity believed by him. I have conscientiously given you my reasons for rejecting several of your articles of faith; and I shall now candidly give you my reasons for rejecting the popular doctrine of *endless misery*, and consequently embracing that of universal happiness. I have already proved that sin is not infinite, therefore it cannot deserve infinite punishment. God is just, and will proportion the punishment to the offence; therefore the doctrine of endless punishment is false. I know you reject with a just abhorrence the doctrine of particular and individual *election and reprobation*, but I confess I was never able to see the great difference you talk of between foreknowledge and decrees. It is impossible there should be any contingences with Omnipotence. I am confident that you will not allow God ever made one soul to be endlessly miserable; but if any ever should be, I can very easily prove that he made them for that express purpose. There are two ways in which you try to prove that notwithstanding multitudes will be irrevocably lost, that God did not make them for that purpose, but to be saved; both of which I shall examine and refute.

1st. You say that his knowledge has nothing to do with their conduct, and you endeavour to illustrate and prove it, by the following simile: You say a man looks out of his window, and sees another man walking along the street past him. Now, you add, the first man's seeing the other walk was not the cause of his walking, but the contrary; the last one's walking was the cause of the first one's seeing him walk. So, you say, that the sinner's going to hell is the reason why God sees him go there, his knowledge being founded on our conduct. What you say of the men is true, but when you apply it to the Deity and his creatures, it is a mere sophism. This first man did not create the other nor give him

his ability to walk past his house, therefore it is not an ingenuous argument. Before God made man, he knew what he would do; he knew whether he would be endlessly miserable or happy. He gave him all his moral and physical powers, and if they lead him to *endless misery*, he knew they would, and gave them to him for that purpose. I beseech you candidly to weigh the following arguments and see whether you are able to answer them. The President of the United States possesses creative power and infinite wisdom; he informs the members of congress that he will make a rational immortal being, to go to the south pole where he is to enjoy perpetual felicity—the day of creation arrives, the creature is made—he is told where he must go to be happy—power is given him to go there; he is told if he goes to the north pole, he will be confined in endless misery—he is then left at liberty to go where he pleases, and he goes directly to the north pole, and is shut up in endless night. The members of congress ask the President, if he knew the creature he made would go to the north pole, and be miserable? The answer is, Yes, I knew it. And did you make him to go there? No—I made him to go to the south pole, where I intended he should enjoy perpetual happiness, but you see he has frustrated my gracious design concerning him; for he has gone to the north pole and is shut up in everlasting despair. Now I ask, would the members of congress be such dupes as to believe him? Would they believe that the President, knowing that he would go to the north pole and be miserable, made him to go to the south pole, and be happy? Would they not think all his professions of love a mere cheat? Could they believe he made him to be happy, when he knew he never would be; but on the contrary, knew he would be miserable? I ask further, could they think the President a good man, in exerting his power to make a being whom he knew would, and consequently designed should be, miserable? Would a farmer raise animals, knowing they would not answer the purpose for which he designed them, nor indeed any valuable purpose? Would the manufacturer manufacture goods to sell, when he knew he could never sell them, but should lose them and all his labour? Would the missionaries go to India to preach to the Indians, if they knew they should do them no good, but should be the means of making them more wretched than they are? Would any of you, my brethren, purchase an article knowing that it would not answer the purpose for which you purchased it? Can you think, then, that God made men to go to heaven, when he knew they would never go there? Do you think he is less wise or less consistent than yourselves? I trust you are satisfied if God knew any would be miserable, before he made them, he could not have made them for happiness, and as he could not have made them for happiness, and as he could not have been indifferent, but must have had some design in making them, he must have made them for misery; and if he made them for misery, he is a wicked being, and deserves to be hated by all his offspring; and the Calvinists are justifiable in de-

siring to dethrone him. What benevolent mind, but would wish them success!

There is another way in which you endeavour to clear the Deity of blame in sending men into everlasting misery. You say there may be contingencies with Omniscience; and to illustrate it, you say that God has created thousands of worlds, but there is room for millions more. Now you add, Omnipotence only implies power that can do all things possible to be done, and not power that does all possible things. So, say you, Omniscience only implies wisdom that *can* know all things, and not wisdom that *does* know all things. This also is a subtle sophism, a mere subterfuge, well calculated to deceive the artless. You say there is room for more worlds, and that God can make more, but how do you know it? The whole force of your argument rests on what you have taken for granted, which is not self-evident, and which you cannot prove. The Scriptures say, “Known unto him are all his works from the beginning;” and the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments, give us all possible reason to believe that God is not ignorant of what is in future. Wisdom is the fulness of the Godhead, and the essence of the divine nature. It is that attribute of the Deity, by which he is directed in all his works. Wisdom must say, what must be left undone, and what is proper to be done, and Omniscience must obey its mandate, otherwise inconsistent things might be done by Jehovah! God’s ignorance of what will take place in future, does not place his character in a more amiable light, than if he knew and designed it. There is not much to choose between an ignorant God and a wicked one, especially if the ignorant one might know if he would. One suffers his offspring to be lost, because he has no disposition to save them, and the other because he does not know they will be, and is too indolent to exercise the *wisdom and power*, which he possesses, to make them happy. Permit me to say, my brethren, that although I am a mortal enemy to Calvinism, I do think it more philosophical than Arminianism; and so far as the two doctrines relate to the character of the Deity, I can see nothing to choose between them.

I come now in a more particular manner to offer you some of my reasons for embracing the doctrine of the final happiness of all men.—“Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.” How could the angel say “to all people,” if but a part only would be benefited by the gospel? “The Father sent not the Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed—death. For he hath put all things under his feet. And when all things shall be subdued unto him [mind, *unto him*,] then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, [observe the same words, *unto him*,] that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

And having made peace through the blood of the cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him I say, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven. That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth, that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in him. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto HIM that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. God is love. *There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love.*" These texts of scripture which I have quoted, I candidly think, prove to a demonstration, and beyond the possibility of contradiction, the final happiness of all men. The Bible never contradicts itself, and if the happiness of all men can be proved by it—endless misery cannot. As to those texts which *partialists* quote to prove that innumerable multitudes will be inevitably lost, I can easily prove they have been all wretchedly perverted, and have no reference to any transactions beyond this world. Take a short explanation of Matt. xxv. 46, "And these shall go away," &c. Our Lord's prophetic discourse in the 24th and 25th chapters, is founded on a question proposed by the disciples. "Tell us, when shall these things be?" &c. The conjunctions and adverbs are so used in these chapters as to make it next to impossible for an intelligent unprejudiced mind to carry these scenes there described beyond the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ had said in the 23d chapter, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate," &c. The question of the disciples was founded on that remark. They wished to know when the temple and city would be destroyed, and what would be the signs that should precede it, and the end of the world, or of the Jewish dispensation. Christ immediately gives them a most sublime and awful description of that dreadful event—and he says in the 34th verse of the 24th chapter, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled." The 25th commences with "Then," at that time, and the connexion is kept up to the end of the chapter. That generation passed away about 1800 years ago, and there is no other alternative, but ingenuously to acknowledge that the events described in these chapters, were fulfilled before that generation passed away, or that Christ was a false prophet. I should be glad to say more on this and similar texts that have been quoted to prove the doctrine of endless misery, but I have not room in this letter: I pray you to examine the Scriptures for yourselves; it is possible you are in an error. "Perfect love cast-

eth out fear." Is it possible to believe the doctrine of endless misery, and not tremble with fear? Who would be safe? Who could enjoy perfect love, and view themselves and all their tender and beloved connexions exposed to endless ruin every moment!

O, my brethren, I hardly know how to bid you adieu. I wish I could see you all face to face; and answer your every objection to God's free unbounded and impartial LOVE to mankind. You think it impossible that a man who has committed but one sin, and dies without a supernatural conversion, should be saved; yet you think a man may live to be old, and sin all his days, and repent a few hours before his death and go to heaven. You think a man may commit many murders and live a few years, and repent and be saved, yet if a man commits one murder, and has no opportunity to repent here, he cannot be saved.—You ought to be careful how you limit the mercy of God, or bound his goodness by earth's contracted span. He is unchangeable, and will be the same benevolent Being in the world to which we are hastening, that he is here. The popular theories of the various partialists or believers in endless misery, seem to amount to the following: God existed one eternity alone, and then made angels pure and holy;—one of them became unholy, being moved to sin by a holy principle inherent in his holy nature, and drew a multitude of his holy brethren after him, and was cast out of heaven into a lake burning with brimstone, and there confined. God at length made the earth, and created a man and woman, and placed them on it to till the ground; he planted a garden with a variety of fruit trees, and gave them the liberty to eat of all except one, which he forbid them to touch on pain of death. They being holy, had no disposition to disobey, and lest they should not, the Lord sent, or permitted to go (which is the same thing) the angel which he had some time before cast out of heaven, to tempt them to transgress his law. This wicked angel took possession of the body of a snake, or, according to Adam Clarke, a monkey, and watched his opportunity when the woman was alone, and persuaded her to eat an apple, cherry, or peach. She finding that the fruit was good and had made her wise, like a good wife carried some to her husband and his eyes were opened also, and they both became as gods, knowing good from evil. The Father was about to punish them according to his word, but his Son offered to die in their stead,—the offer was accepted, the Son died—the purchased reconciliation has been made known, man continues dead in trespasses and sins, and goes astray from the womb, and naturally hates God and all good. Yet lest he should be saved, Beelzebub and a host of subordinate devils, are permitted to wander about and counteract the various designs of the Son. Almighty power sometimes prevails, and snatches here and there a solitary individual from the verge of endless ruin, but original sin and the devil are generally too strong for Omnipotence, and the greatest part of mankind are hurried by them through this wicked world down, down, down to the chambers of endless night, where the vengeance of the God infinite love

and mercy, is wreaked upon them to endless ages; while devils sport themselves with their groans and lamentations, the God of tender compassion laughs at their calamity—heaven resounds with the praise of Jehovah for his infinite goodness for saving a few, when Christ made a vicarious atonement for all. The saints look down from the battlements of heaven, and shout forth transporting songs of victory, and make the heavenly arches ring with loud acclamations of joy, that they have escaped the demerit of their crimes, and that while their fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, beloved friends and relatives are wrapt up in the keenest despair, they are safe and happy!!! O, my brethren, do not let the chimeras of a too warm imagination deceive you. Universalism is not that licentious doctrine you think it is. It does not give men the least license to sin. It teaches that no man can transgress the eternal rule of right with impunity. It teaches that every man will be punished and rewarded according to his works: it teaches that God will by no means clear the guilty: it teaches that the government of God is purely parental, and that all punishment is disciplinary, and designed to reclaim the offender. I do not believe the doctrine of endless misery ever made any one any better. Slaves are not so likely to be virtuous as freemen. I expect my name will be cast out as evil, for believing that all men will be saved; but when I read that the last enemy shall be destroyed, which is death, how can I believe that there will still remain innumerable beings, enemies to God and themselves, suffering the pains of eternal death, when death is destroyed and no enemies left? I only believe your prayers will be answered. You pray that all may be saved, and I believe they will. So long as I honestly believe the doctrine of Universal Salvation, I shall endeavour zealously to inculcate and spread it among my fellow men, regardless of the threats and anathemas of bigoted zealots. My prayer to God is, that Israel may be saved, and I believe they will. Yes, I believe the time will come, when all the human family will be made virtuous and happy, and enter one temple, and worship one God, and chant one song of universal praise to Jehovah for ever and ever. Transporting, delicious thought! Universal Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will to men! I bid you adieu, but it is only for a little season—we shall shortly see eye to eye, when none will be left to say, Know ye the Lord, for all shall know him from the least to the greatest. While I honestly beseech you to think on what I have written, I subscribe myself, yours, most affectionately.

ELIPHALET CASE, JUN.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—As you declare yourself a man who is determined to speak the truth, regardless of the consequences, and having with great force and truth shown many evils which exist among us, such as raising large sums of money to pamper the Rev. Clergy, for foreign missions, domestic missions, Theological schools, &c.—I am induced to call your

attention to a few other evils which I do not recollect you have noticed. One is, the fashion, as I will call it, of building new churches, (as I understand a number was the last year) *on credit*, and then to *preach, beg, and plead* for the money to pay for them, not only of those of their own faith, but of *all others* of whom they can obtain a cent; and I fear, often obtain it from those who are not able, by stating, *Surely you would not like to have our church or furniture sold*, for that would greatly injure *our* religious cause. Another evil which exists among us, arising from the practice of persons who talk a great deal against *extravagance*, &c., and urge the practice of honesty and charity, while they themselves are in the habit of getting in debt by borrowing money, &c. among their religious friends, without the least rational prospect of ever being able to repay them. I wish your candid remarks, and should they be such as I may think will be productive of good to our fellow citizens, I trust you will hear again from

FRANKLIN.

REMARKS.

The first evil complained of by Franklin, is one which, however we may deprecate its certain tendency, will never be remedied while the means of its continuance remains, unless the public should see with different eyes, and act from purer motives than they do at present. Although a comparatively small number of the religious establishments in this city are conducted according to principles of economy, we believe no reflecting man, whose judgment is the result of sober thinking, will deny the truth of the position, that, take all the churches of the city into one view, and estimate correctly their cost and yearly expenditures, including every appendage, there is enough wasted, in useless expenses, to build and maintain the same number of establishments were they conducted as the spirit of Christ dictates. It is a fact, that the word *economy*, in its application to religious purposes, has become, in a great measure, *obsolete*. To prove this we give the following—When the church erected between the Bowery and Elizabeth-street was commenced, a reverend gentleman solicited aid, in contributions, from the pulpit, and urged the giving for the purpose named, because the money would be appropriated according to the principles of *economy*! The *economical* church is completed, all but *paying for it*, and is a perfect *satire* on clerical pretensions. An expense was incurred, before so much as a *handful* of materials were bought or collected, to an amount greater than was necessary to purchase a convenient lot of ground, and erect a substantial building of the same magnitude! *Fourteen thousand dollars* for ground! How much the *economical* church has cost in addition, we do not know; but will venture to suppose it was a similar expense.

It is possible that reverend clergymen have a definition of the word *economy*, different from laymen. Be this as it may, the laymen are most interested; and we advise them to be their own lexicographers. We give it as our opinion, that no clergyman has demands upon the tenderness, the charity, and the generosity of the community, or any part there-

of, beyond any portion of the human family. If a section of the community associate for religious purposes, and employ a brother as their officiating head, they, unquestionably, are bound by any agreement they may make with him. But, let it be remembered, every dollar they furnish him to be expended in extravagance, is taken from the poor, the widow, and the fatherless. And every dollar expended unnecessarily in building and maintaining churches, is taken from the same stock. We offer it as an opinion, that religious pride, or Pharisaism, that plague worse than the pestilence, is generated and fostered in expensive religious establishments. Every pretension, cherished or avowed, which is contrary to the humble doctrine of the meek and lowly Jesus, is Pharisaism; whatever may be its shape, or in whatever garb or guise it may appear.

No truth can be more obvious than this—We cannot increase the *power*, the *wisdom*, or the *goodness* of God, nor by any means add to his *happiness* or perfection. Consequently, no man is required even to attempt this. But we can increase the power of the *weak*, the wisdom of the *ignorant*, and correct the *evil* propensities of our poor erring brethren of the children of men. Man can add to the happiness of his *fellow* man, and lessen, in a qualified sense, his imperfections. To do this, is pure religion, in the sight of God, while all else is but a tinkling cymbal.

The second evil our correspondent notices, which consists in declaiming against extravagance, dishonesty, and uncharitableness, and at the same time indulging and practising the evils complained of, by habitually taxing others to defray the expense of the vice, is an evil of great magnitude in its operation and tendency. The dependence of man, in this mode of being, upon his fellow man, and the advantages which flow from an honest and judicious management of temporal concerns, is a subject of universal interest. The common consent of past ages, and the wisdom of all who have gone before us declares, in emphatic language, the *vanity* of sublunary things. Setting aside the pressing wants of man, the indispensable necessities of life, while passing through this vale of tears, man can find no true enjoyment in parade and ostentation, but must join the wise man of old, and say, "All is vanity, and vexation of spirit." Independent of the real joy and satisfaction which constantly attends an upright course, and showers perennial pleasures on him who relieves the unfortunate child of sorrow and want, which must be dispensed with, comes the corroding pain of satiety, and the unwelcome certainty of exertion and toil, prolific only in generating distrust and trouble. A deliberate course which will exceed the probable means a man possesses, and which can, at best, only procure fresh cause of inquietude, is folly in the extreme.

There is one fact, however, connected with the history of man, which charity should record, when judgment is given of his demerits. We mean the deceitfulness of the heart of man, which the Scriptures assure us, "is deceitful above all things." By

heart, we would be understood to mean the *passions and desires* of man, including his imagination, which is a proteus as circumstances move him. To believe in the certain happening of that which is desired, and to obey the cheatings of imagination, and desire that which is pleasing in prospect, is, perhaps, the common lot of mortals, in a greater or less degree. It is, therefore, the duty of all, (because their present welfare demands it,) to consult the future with an eye fixed upon the past. To ascertain, by the convictions of sober judgment, the fruit of experience, and the inspirations of reason, the probability for the future; and not launch the frail bark of expectation, without a rudder or a sail, on the tempestuous sea of improbabilities and uncertainty. It has been said, that "The wise man learns wisdom from the experience of others, and the fool from his own troubles and mishaps." But the learning wisdom from one's own experience, is so hard a lesson, that, we think, it is wise to complete the task.

To judge, then, of the moral turpitude of the action, requires some knowledge of the motive which originated it, and the quantum of deception the recipient laboured under at the time of the misdeed.

It cannot be a difficult question to decide, whether a man is the gainer by supporting a style of living beyond his present means, even if futurity should open a new current for his income, and find a panacea for the ills that are past. For, there is nothing future, in reality, to man. The present passing moment, alone, is all that he can claim, and it is gone, ere his claim is advanced. The past, like a vision, flits before his mental eyes, and man spends the present in useless regrets, or in the insanity of uncertain expectations. The only path to which true wisdom points, is one, where no thorns of disappointment shoot at every step, to lacerate the weary traveller. The past is gone. The future belongs to those who come after. The present is our own; the past is worth nothing, for it can never be recalled. The future cannot be estimated, until it is known; and then it will have gone like the years beyond the flood.

The goods which man ought to prize, in this mode of being, are common stock, but diverted from their destination, and misused, they prove a curse where they might have blessed. The experience of all men, as well as the voice of wisdom, declares, that true "economy is riches." That the poor may be rich, and the rich poor; but none so poor as him who is dissatisfied continually with *his own* possessions, and avariciously covets the goods of *others*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Shall the frail creature of yesterday, who to-day glories in his wisdom, and to-morrow will be food for worms, usurp the seat which belongs alone to the Creator, and pass judgment on his fellow creatures? When man possesses the same power of knowing the heart, which he had, who said to the Pharisees of old—"Oh! generation of vipers," then, and then only, may he address the same lan-

guage to those whom he considers hypocrites, or rather, whom he *knows* as hypocrites; for such power precludes the possibility of mistake.

Surely, it is absurd for us to use these words of Christ, and urge as an apology that we are bound to follow his example, as it would be to say to the diseased—"I will—be thou clean." We neither possess the knowledge requisite, in the former case, nor the power necessary in the latter; it is therefore an act of presumption.

I think you have been unfortunate in selecting the 3d chapter of James, to prove the correctness of your sentiments. We are there taught the tremendous effects that arise from giving unbridled license to that "little member," which "boasteth great things." And as the tongue, or pen, are merely agents to communicate the thoughts which live in the heart, we may as effectually and as culpably write *daggers* as speak them.

Even after the dreadful charge that "out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing"—The apostle does not denounce them as "vipers," or "hypocrites," but mildly and affectionately adds, "My brethren, these things ought not so to be." "Where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is *from above*, is first pure, then *peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy* and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace, of them that make peace."

I will not refer you to any particular chapter in corroboration of my views; for every part of the New Testament abounds in precepts of forbearance and long-suffering. "Judge not that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and persecute you: for if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?" "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." These are among the injunctions which our Saviour has given, and which we are bound to take for the rule of our conduct; and though from the imperfection of our nature, we are often found swerving from this divine rule, in proportion as our actions are governed by it, will we "lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty."

On first reading your answer, I had not the least idea of making a reply, but silence appears so like acquiescence in your sentiments, that I have been induced to trouble you once more, I trust for the last time, for disputation is so apt to engender strife, that I would always avoid it, if consistent with my ideas of duty.

"A UNITED CHRISTIAN FRIEND."

New-York, Sept. 15th, 1823.

REMARKS.

We assure our correspondent that the present disputation shall "not engender any strife" on our part. If we are wrong, we hope we shall be as ready

to confess and forsake the fault as to commit it. But if we are right, surely our correspondent cannot desire a course of conduct contrary to the convictions of our judgment or conscience. It is unpleasant to be found with a mistake, however honestly we come by it. And we cannot well avoid the conclusion, that our correspondent possesses one mistaken idea, at least.

It is a common fault with mankind, to wink at errors in doctrine and practice, not from charity or love to the offender, but from interested motives altogether. This position is so obviously true, that we trust we shall be excused producing evidence to prove it.

The editor of this paper may be accused of egotism, or vanity, or both; but he will venture, for once, to say, that in the discharge of, what he considers, his duty, in conducting this paper, *interest*, view it in what shape you will, has never sat in his judgment-seat. It is a small matter with him, whether he dies in a palace or on a dunghill, so that he dies in proper time. And as to living, may Heaven in mercy preserve him from the principles which would sanction the sacrifice of any good conviction or purpose, to prolong life a single moment.

We must be permitted to dissent from the very popular sentiment, that when a man disregards the opinion of the world, he is likely to lose even his own good opinion of himself; or, at most, not to merit it. We are willing that the world shall think as favourably as they please; or vice versa. Thoughts are *brittle* things. The editor of this paper must look to his own bosom, and let the world look to theirs. The praise of the universe would be a poor substitute for *self*-approbation; and a good conscience can do without it. But what has all this to do with the subject in question? Why, just this—

When we, from a conviction of duty, undertake any thing, we are too busy with our undertaking to think of consequences. We must leave this part to others. Had Paul hedged his purposes with cautious reflections and thoughts of the future, and confined every movement within the pale of worldly prudence, he would have escaped many perils, and died a good Pharisee. Had Stephen (See Acts vii.) followed (what appears to us to be) the counsel of our correspondent, he would not have been stoned to death.

Will our correspondent make a choice of difficulties? Shall we conclude that we do not possess the "power of knowing the heart," as did Christ, and never venture an opinion of right and wrong, without incurring the charge of presumption? Did Stephen possess the power? Shall our correspondent have the privilege of judging *us*? Or, does he possess this power? What said James to, or of, the "rich men?" (See James v. 4.) Will pampering clergymen make peace? Does the wisdom from above authorize it? Did James and Stephen judge others? We judge *no man*. We deal with *divine doctors*. We would *love all men*. There lives not the man, whose happiness we do not earnestly desire. Would approbation of the present style of clerical dignity, comport with "godliness and honesty?"

Our correspondent has acted the part of an honest man. However erroneous his conceptions may be, so long as they are honestly entertained, so long they should be defended. We tender him the assurance of our respect, and request him not to cherish, for a moment, an idea that we are infallible.

* * Queries. How would our correspondent construe Matt. vii. 1, 2, were he on a jury, and required to condemn or acquit a fellow man? Would he say, If I judge this man guilty of death, I myself shall be judged to the death? Is it presumption to abide by the criterion established by Christ; "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them?" Does the word *ye*, refer to the "frail creature," or to Christ, the speaker?

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—Being a poor girl, and obliged to work by the month for my living, I often have the privilege of sitting in the kitchen, *alone*, to contemplate the universal goodness of God. Not being admitted into the parlour when the gentleman of the house is at prayer, with the rest of the family; he being a *good man*, and a Presbyterian. Please to inform me whether this is right?

If it be consistent with the rules of the Gospel Herald, I should be much pleased to see your comment on the above. M. E.

REMARKS.

We presume our fair correspondent is not sufficiently hackneyed in the fashion of the religion of this world, to be fully aware of the "ruling passion" in the mind of the popular Christian. Religion, (that is, what the *world* esteem as religion), is as much under the dominion of *fashion*, as the garment of the devotee itself. Two religions exist in our day, and will continue until error is annihilated by the fire of Divine Truth. It is not uncharitable to conclude, that the "*good man*" and "Presbyterian," M. E. speaks of, is solicitous to preserve the distinctive dignity of his religion. In his devotions, therefore, he must exclude those whom his *feelings* debar from his imaginary heaven. Our correspondent will find a solace in the knowledge of the being and character of her Saviour. His humility shines in contrast with the fashionable affectation of modern times. Prayer, in faith, always acceptable to a faithful God, requires no other temple than the universe—no altar but a humble and contrite heart. Our Heavenly Father is always present; and his presence is made visible to the eye of faith, when the gauze and tinsel of this world is shut from our view, and nothing sublunary is permitted to cloud and obscure the glory of his face, and obstruct the view of his peaceful heaven.

M. E. has pre-eminently the advantage of the "good Presbyterian." While his narrow conceptions imprison his mind in doubt and fear, and his pride shuts the door of love and sympathy, she can smile with rapture in the delightful anticipation of the restoration of a ruined world; and, by faith, see the great family of man, congregated in the glorious presence of their Father and their God.

From the (Canadaigua) Plain Truth.

STUPENDOUS FRAUD.

The charges brought by the Montreal man against the trustees of the English missionary society, still remain uncontradicted and unanswered. They are not noticed in London—but have spread dismay and alarm in the orthodox ranks in the United States. The New-Haven Intelligencer says—"A writer in the *Montreal Christian Register* has undertaken to prove that a society in England, called the "New England Company," have in their hands immense sums of money, originally destined to Christianize the Indians of this country, but which *they have perverted*. How far he is correct, we have not the proper data for judging. * * * * * It may be that this society, which *we confess* seems not to be very well known, has funds to a considerable amount; but the donors of charities, and the enemies of benevolence, are so scrutinizing, that it seems almost impossible that they should be very large. It would be a dangerous experiment for any society of men to undertake to embezzle moneys to *so large* an amount as the society in question are supposed to have done; and it is also a *hazardous business* to accuse such a body of men of such a crime."

Mark the last clause of the quotation! A hazardous business to accuse such men! He is right. Why hazardous? Because the accuser is placed in the "imminent deadly breach" of fanatical fury. The Christian public will not lose sight of the following facts:—

1. The Montreal Register is a missionary paper, and its establishment was hailed with joy by the Boston Recorder, Herald, &c.

2. These charges were made by orthodox men, in an orthodox journal, accusing an English missionary society of embezzling funds to the immense amount of \$4,000,000; or as a party editor would say, **ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY TONS OF SILVER!**

3. Ninety days were amply sufficient time to carry these charges from Montreal to London, and to bring back either a stern denial or a triumphant refutation from the accused party.

4. Eight months have elapsed, and the Londoners say not a word—they are as silent as the grave. Would the eagle-eyed advocates of missions in that city suffer this grievous accusation to rest if it were false? Would not the possession of \$4,000,000 enable these trustees to *buy* the Montreal man and every missionary editor in the United States?

5. Why do our countrymen volunteer to defend Englishmen, who have *suffered judgment to go against them by default*—who have *tacitly* confessed their guilt? and what did the New-Haven man mean by saying it was a "*hazardous business* to accuse such a body of men of such a crime?" Give us light upon this dark business! Give us light, my brethren!

DR. CLARKE'S DIFFICULTIES.

In our last Number we published an extract from Dr. Clarke's commentary, on Matt. xvi. in which

Dr. C. admitted that Christ came, as there described, although he contends for a future day of judgment. The declaration of Christ is plain. "The Son of man shall come," &c. "and then [when the Son of man shall come,] he shall reward every man according to his works." Now, the Doctor's future judgment is to reward them *again*. If it is not for this purpose, what is it for? The Doctor has admitted, that in this mode of being, men are "rewarded according to their works." If this is the truth, can it possibly be made to appear, that another day of judgment is necessary? We repeat the question—What is your day of judgment for? Is it to reward men according to their *works*? This cannot be; for you have admitted that this is done already in this world!

A REASON WANTED.

We ask a reason of those who unblushingly misrepresent the doctrine of the salvation of *all* men, for so doing. The pulpits, that is, a number of them, in this city, teem with abuse and falsehood. We sincerely ask all *honest* men, to whatever sect they may belong, if this abominable conduct is honourable among men, or consistent with the Christian character? If our faith and doctrines are so extremely vile and wicked as our pious opposers pretend, why misrepresent? Why not represent our vile doctrine just as it is? Surely there is a monstrous incongruity in the professions and practices of these Reverend clergymen, who thus vilify Universalists, and give wrong statements of their faith. The command says, "Thou shalt not bear *false witness* against thy neighbour." Do these gentlemen consider Universalists as *outlawed* by God and man, and fair game for them to shoot at? Is this the plain state of the case? If not, how shall we reconcile their conduct with their professions?

LOOK AT THIS.

"For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her." Lam. iv. 6.

What was the punishment of the Sodomites? *Endless* misery, of course, for all the pious people say so. *Endless* misery "in a moment!" And the punishment of the daughter of God's people is *greater*! What can be greater than *endless* misery? We read in another place, that God rewarded his people "double for all their sins." Can you *double* *endless* misery? The punishment of Sodom, we say, on the authority of the Scriptures, was, as it were only for a *moment*. But the punishment of Jerusalem was greater, for the hands of the Roman army stayed on her.

Ah! How is this? Do we not read of Sodom "suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire?" Yes. But where do you read of it? Not in the original. They suffered this vengeance as in a *moment*. The *material* fire which produced the overthrow of Sodom, burned for *ages*. But the Sodomites were punished in the fire, and suffered *its* vengeance, only a

moment. The vengeance of the *fire*, reader, not the vengeance of *God*, remember this.

IMPORTANT QUERIES.

In our last Number, p. 133, col. 2. in E. C.'s letter to the Methodists, it is declared, that Christ "was ignorant of the time when Jerusalem was to be destroyed." Was not the prophet Daniel greater than Christ? He foretold the time. Was not Christ also ignorant of Daniel's prophecy? We read, John v. 20. "For the Father loveth the Son, and *showeth him all things that himself doeth*." Can this be true, when the Father withheld from the Son the knowledge of the *time* when Jerusalem should be destroyed?

In Matt. xxiv. 3, Christ's disciples asked him, "When shall these things be?" Did Christ reply, *I do not know*? Or, did he not inform them? When Christ said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," did he mean that he was *ignorant*, and possessed only *some* power? Was Christ "the brightness of glory, and the express image" of the *hypostasis* of the Father, and at the same time more *ignorant* than the prophet Daniel? In fine, is it wise or prudent, to fasten upon an isolated passage, whose genuineness has been so often questioned, and produce it to contradict the convictions of reason, and the numerous declarations of the Scriptures?

☞ We recommend to the Editor of the Gospel Palladium to correct an error which recently shone so conspicuously in his paper. We have not withheld any papers from him. So far as truth can be useful to him, he has liberty to use it.

** Will C. L. E. call at this office?

GENERAL CONVENTION.

The General Convention of Universalists will Convene at Clinton, (N. Y.) on the 3d Wednesday and Thursday of the present month.

KNEELAND'S TESTAMENT.

For Sale at this Office, The New Testament, in Greek, Greek and English, and English. The Greek according to Griesbach; the English upon the basis of the fourth London edition of the Improved Version, with an attempt to farther improvement from the translations of Campbell, Wakefield, Scarlett, Macknight, and Thompson. By Abner Kneeland, Minister of the First Independent Church of Christ, called Universalist, in Philadelphia. The Greek and English in 2 vols. Price—Greek, \$3. Greek and English, \$4. Do. in calf, \$4 50, English, \$1 50. Do. in calf, \$1 75.

ALSO, FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE,

Ballou's Notes on the Parables.—Ballou on Atonement.—Ballou's Eleven Sermons.—Discourse delivered at the Installation of David Pickering, by J. Bisbe, Jun.—Discourse by D. Pickering, on the Doctrine of St. Paul.

AGENTS FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Capt. J. C. Churchill, Portland, (Me.) Theodosius Parsons, Esq. Holmes Hole, (Mass.) Messrs. Noah S. Bailey, Norwalk, (Conn.) Richard H. Woods, White Plains; Ralph Malbone, Brooklyn; Benjamin Wright, Jamaica; Ashbel Stoddard, Hudson; William R. Gregory, Ithaca, Stephen Van Schaack, Albany, (N. Y.) Henry Whyte, Petersburg, (Vir.) Timothy Bigelow, Palmyra, Portage Co. David Loring, Cincinnati; Horace Burroughs, Boardman, Trumbull Co. (Ohio.) Gershom D. Miller, Rahway; Williams Woolley, Morristown, (New-Jersey.)

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1823.

NO. 19.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

To the Rev. Joel Osborn:

Dear Sir—I have perused the Tract written by Andrew Fuller, which you presented to me in friendship; as such I received it, and now, after a careful examination, I shall attempt to express my opinion of it in friendship likewise.

Of Mr. Fuller's first position, I remark, that *endless* punishment, in itself, I do firmly believe to be unjust. 1st. Because an infinitely wise and good being, never would have forced me into existence for the purpose of making me miserable. 2. If he knew before he created me, that my conduct in this life would be such as to merit *endless* torment, as he is a God of mercy and justice, he never would have caused me to exist. 3. That he *foreknew* all things, can never be denied. These premises have not arisen from diminutive notions of the evil of sin. I view sin with the greatest abhorrence, because it makes me miserable, and is the most inveterate enemy that man can have. Mr. F.'s insinuation that those who reject the doctrine of *endless* misery are not proper judges of the Scriptures, is the very essence of priestcraft. I do not hold "a principle from which it will follow, that millions will be finally happy who will not be indebted to either the grace of God, or the death of Christ for their happiness." But I do believe that exemption from endless misery (and from all misery that will not produce the sinner's greatest good) is the sinner's right. Farther, that man was never *exposed* to endless misery. That Christ never died to save one soul from endless misery; but to save all men "from their *sins*." And that salvation is the gift of God. Mr. F. says, the "whole tenor of the Scripture saith to the righteous, It shall be well with him; and to the wicked, it shall be ill with him." I say so too; and this is what Universalists teach; but will Mr. Fuller pretend to people of common sense, that the word "*ill*" means *endless* misery? Or will you, my dear Sir, for once step into the columns of this paper, (and you shall have a gracious hearing I assure you) and prove to the good people of America, that because sinners are threatened to fare *ill*, that it means they shall be consigned to fire and brimstone in another world, and their agonizing souls to be roasted "throughout the wasteless ages of eternity, as long as God himself shall exist?"

Mr. Fuller asks, "What doctrine besides this can you find in the Bible, that affords encouragement to a sinner going on still in his trespasses," &c.? I answer, The doctrine that teaches sinners that they shall *not surely die*. The doctrine of endless misery is the only doctrine that affords encouragement

to a sinner going on still in his trespasses; and here follows the reasons why I think so. The advocates of the doctrine of endless misery say, that the death which was threatened in the garden of Eden, was death temporal, spiritual, and death eternal. But do they pretend that Adam died temporally and eternally in the day of his transgression? No. But they say he became *liable* to these deaths. Well, the serpent did not say that they would not be liable to die; he said they should not surely die; and these our opposers now contend, that they did not die. Then who spake the truth? God said they should die, in the day of transgression. The serpent said they should not; and these our opposers say, that they did not. Now, see if these pretended Gospel preachers do not in fact hold up the very doctrine now, which the serpent proposed to Eve. What was his doctrine? Did he tell Eve that she should not be damned eternally in another world if she committed sin? No! he said nothing about this. What did he say? He said "ye shall not surely die." When? Answer, in the *day* of transgression. Well, this is just what our opposers now contend for; they say, that the punishment of sin is not here in the present state, where it is committed. (And Mr. Fuller intimates the same in his Tract; he says, "None, it is plainly intimated, will be able to enter there, the strait gate, who have not agonized here.") They try all they can to make people believe that in the present state, sin yields enjoyment; and if they were sure of eternal happiness hereafter, they would by all means live in sin in this life. This is most surely the way the carnal mind tempts us to sin. We may examine ourselves or others, and we shall find, that temptation to sin proceeds from this, and no other ground.

Go ask that poor dissipated creature, whether he indulges his sensual appetites with a view of making himself happy in some future day, or in another world? Will he tell you that such is his expectation? No. Such temptation never presented itself to man. The temptation is an expectation of *present* pleasure, of gratification, of happiness in the present time; and it always says, "ye shall not surely die;" but we always find that sin brings death (misery) along with it. Lust when it conceives bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is committed bringeth forth death.

Of Mr. Fuller's passages of Scripture in contrast, under pages third and fourth, I remark, that the limits of this paper will not admit of a formal notice of the whole; therefore, for the present, I must confine myself to a few; but at the same time I would wish to have you understand, that I do not consider

Mr. F. has introduced one passage of Scripture in the whole of the Tract, which proves the *endless* punishment of sinners. In page 3, we read, "The hope of the righteous shall be gladness, but the expectation of the wicked shall perish." Now I inform you, Sir, and all whom it may concern, that this is the very doctrine that Universalists teach; and at all times they enforce it with an ardent desire that it shall be impressed on the sinner's heart, never to be effaced until he is reclaimed. And pointing him to the glorious hope of the righteous, portraying in all the colours of love and affection, their happiness, in pity and compassion for his lost condition, in hope that he may turn from the error of his ways and live. But because their expectations perish, does it mean that they shall be endlessly miserable? No such thing. How uncharitable are the conclusions of those who teach the doctrine of an endless hell, that because poor frail man deceives himself, and is led into sin, and every expectation of happiness perisheth, (for, remember, that all mankind are continually seeking for happiness; no one will admit that we seek for misery,) they wish to aggravate his sufferings by taking him to another world to be punished; and what is infinitely more horrible, he is for ever to be writhing in torture, and never to be released. May God in his infinite mercy so direct and enlighten my understanding, that the fabricated vision of endless torment may never flit across my imagination. I could offer this prayer for all mankind, but God will do all his pleasure in his own time.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This passage is also introduced to show the final condition of the righteous and the wicked. But this does not seem to agree with the final resurrection of man, then, if I mistake not, *all* are to be "raised incorruptible," &c. But many of the whole, in this verse, are to awake, from what? Answer, sleep. What! Can immortality sleep, and be insensible? for sleep implies a state of insensibility; and mark, that there is no change here spoken of, they are to awake just as they went to sleep, and in no other condition.—Farther, what is to be done with those who do not wake, for it plainly implies that some will be left in the dust of the earth, for many are to awake, not all? Should you contend, dear Sir, that many means *all*, and that this does actually prove the resurrection of the dead, I fear you will fall into a pit of your own digging, and be very much troubled to get out; for, remember, you will not admit the salvation of *all* men. Now mark what follows, where many are spoken of again. Matt. viii. 11. Many shall come from the east, &c. and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. Now, if you contend for one, you must admit the other. Verse 12, But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into utter darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Now, you believe that sin is an infinite evil, and demands an infinite punishment. The immortal part, of course, only can be punished in another world. Now, where would

be the necessity of our being raised *incorruptible*, if we were immediately to be encumbered with flesh and blood? If the apostle had said that we should be raised corruptible, then there would be some degree of sense in saying, that we should weep and gnash our teeth in another world.

I think Sir, the advocates of endless misery plunge themselves into the pit where there is no bottom, while they vociferate from the pulpit that the flames of hell are hotter than ten thousand fiery furnaces; and the next moment contend that we can never waste away in such an element. I think this part of the doctrine might be illustrated by fair experiment, viz: Hold your finger, dear Sir, for five minutes in the blaze of a candle, and ask yourself whether it be not wasted a little? Or extract a sound tooth, and burn it in brimstone half an hour, and see whether it be not wasted a little. If you find by these experiments, that the materials of which we are composed will stand the test of fire, then I beg of you, dear Sir, to have mercy on your senses and talk no more about sending flesh and blood to your endless hell. "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mr. F. did not quote the whole of the connexion of the above passage, and should his Tract unluckily fall into the hands of some person who had not read the chapter alluded to, they would, I think, be much at a loss what they should believe, to escape this damnation. Now, if this damnation is endless misery, not one soul of Adam's race can ever be saved; for we are all unbelievers until we believe; and remember, there is no condition of repentance in the passage introduced; but as certain as a man does not believe, he will be damned. This is what Universalists teach. So long as we disbelieve the gospel, so long we shall be miserable, and consequently, damned; but where the glorious light of reason illumines the dark and benighted mind of man, he bursts the adamant chains of clerical bondage, soars beyond the doctrines of men, fixes his hopes upon the Eternal word of God, and is saved, from what? answer—from damnation, the consequence of this unbelief. Why? because the truth has made him free.

In page 11 we have the following declaration, which I think is a conclusion bordering upon insanity. Mr. F. says, "whether there shall be a few that shall ultimately be saved, our Lord does not inform us." To convince people who possess their senses and will read a few words in a book called the Bible, I shall introduce the following, Genesis 12. 18. 20. and 28 chapters. Psalms 2. 22. 98. 101 and 104. Isaiah 11. 14. 25. 28 and 45. Matthew 3 and 13. Mark 14 and 15. Luke 3 and 19. John 1. 3. 4. 6. 10 and 12. Acts 2 and 3. Romans 5. 9 and 14. Galatians 4. Ephesians 1. Philippians 2. Colossians 1. 1st Timothy. 2. 2d Timothy 1. Titus 2. Hebrews 2. James 1. 2d of Peter 3. 1st General of John 2, 3 and 4. And Revelation 5. Now there is a mistake somewhere, and if you believe what Mr. F. asserts, you cannot believe the testimonies I have introduced. But should you acknowledge the Scriptures to be

the truth, you cannot believe what Mr. F. has attempted to enforce: In the above are a few testimonies contained in the Bible, upon which my faith rests; and when you prove to me, that those who wrote the Bible were mistaken, and that God revealed to them an untruth, I will retrace my steps and not before. In short, my opinion of Mr. Fulers Tract is the following:

1st. That he was not an honest man, because he perverted scripture, and by his mild and insinuating language deceives the unwary reader. 2d. That I cannot believe the sentiment that is taught in his Tract; and I think if people would search the Scriptures for themselves generally, they would have as poor an opinion of it as I have expressed. I stand ready, Sir, at all times, to give an answer with meekness and fear, of the hope that is within me; and if any person can convince me that I am in an error, it is their duty to do it. But, alas! reason at present is laid aside here, and liberal investigation is forbidden. The passions of the mind are harrowed up with a description of hell, and its furies, in a manner that is incompatible with reason. The doctrine of endless misery, Sir, is the fabrication of men, and of wicked men too. If you dispute this, let me point you to the fagot in ancient days; yea, to the fire made of moist green wood in which John Calvin roasted Michael Servetus. Was this spirit the fruit of the doctrine that teaches love to all mankind, and that taught us in mild and persuasive language to love our enemies, to bless them that curse us?

I mean no disrespect Sir, but I feel it my duty to give you my views of religion generally; you requested it, and therefore, if I should be so unfortunate as to incur your displeasure, I shall have the lasting consolation that my motives were pure. I have frequently heard you misrepresent the doctrine of universal love, in your pulpit. What motive you had, your own conscience will best inform you, or whether you was ignorant of this doctrine it is not for me to judge. Therefore, for your information, and that you may become acquainted with the principles I have embraced, I subjoin the ground work of my faith.

I believe in a Supreme Being, the Creator and preserver of all mankind. I believe the Scriptures to be a revelation of his character, of the object he had in view when he created his offspring man. I believe that sin and its consequences are so inseparably connected, that the sinner will never go unpunished, the reward of his hands shall be given him. But that in the fulness of the dispensation of times, all things will be gathered in Christ. That all mankind will be made the recipients of endless bliss. To this my heart responds in adoration, and glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, good will towards men.

To conclude; I have given you my opinion of the Tract you presented me to read, and my views of religion in as clear a manner as I am capable; and now shall take the liberty to suggest a few queries for your consideration. 1st. When the Deity conceived the design of creating or causing so many

millions of human beings to exist, did he wish or design that they should be eventually happy? Or, did he wish them to be miserable? 2d. Did he know what their future conduct in this life would be? 3d. Was he possessed of a sufficient degree of wisdom to form a plan, whereby the whole human race might be rescued from eternal misery? 4th. Had he a sufficient degree of power to execute his plan, and save the whole human race from eternal perdition? If you admit the above queries, then I ask, What power or combination of powers can frustrate the designs of the Omnipotent Jehovah, and drag to endless perdition those whom he intended should be eventually happy? I request, dear Sir, that you will give me a candid answer to the above queries, in the same spirit that you gave me the Tract to read, and wishing you all the happiness that man can enjoy while in the possession of sublunary things, and a participation with the whole family of man in the more lasting joys of another world,

I subscribe myself your Friend,

A UNIVERSALIST.

Amenia (N. Y.) Aug. 27, 1823.

On the Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures.

BY BISHOP HARE.

Sir—I do not wonder at the surprise with which you received, when we were last together, the advice I ventured to give you in relation to the study of the Scriptures. For one, who is a clergyman himself, to seem to dissuade those of his own order from a study that has so many arguments to recommend it, and which, in the opinion of all good men, ought to be their chief business, has, I confess, the appearance of a strange paradox, and that of the worst sort. It looks like popery and priestcraft; and therefore young and tender minds may easily be forgiven, if they startle at the first proposal of it; those, especially, who have a just sense of the excellency and inspiration of the Scriptures, and are eagerly bent on the pursuit of such truths, as more immediately tend to the advancement of virtue and religion. As you are of that number, and went into orders with no other view, but that you might the better study the Scriptures yourself, and advance the knowledge of them in the world; it was not to be expected you should presently come into other sentiments. Which I am so far from taking amiss, that I think it to your commendation; that neither the affection nor esteem you so often express for an old friend, could prevail with you to act a part that might have the appearance of levity in a matter of so much consequence. Nor is it less for your credit, that you can retain your opinion, without losing your temper, or showing a backwardness to hear what is to be said against it. Most tempers run into extremes; they are either too volatile to be fixed, or else so fixed, that no force nor argument can move them. But it is your happiness, that you can adhere without obstinacy, and change without levity; and therefore I shall think it no trouble to resume the subject, and lay before you, in the best manner

I can, the reasons that seem to make against the study of the Scriptures in the way of private judgment; which I hope will not, upon cooler thoughts, appear so strange to you. You will consider they come from one, who is not more a friend to you, than he is to the church; and, if examples be of any weight, I can assure you this side of the question is by no means destitute of proselytes; and that, when you come to know the world more, you will find this study neglected to a degree you little imagine; but it is reasons, not examples, will determine you. To come therefore to them;

I shall, in the first place, take leave to ask, *Cui bono*, What good can come of so much pains? For it may seem that a free, serious, impartial, and laborious study of the Scriptures will be of no great service, for the following reasons:

First—Because it is plain the orthodox faith is not founded on a nice and critical knowledge of the Scriptures. Many of the ancient Christians, it will be allowed, were not great critics, but argued very much in a mystical way. Origen in particular, who was the greatest scholar Christianity had bred to that time, perpetually turns the letter of Scripture into allegory. From whence we may reasonably conclude, that the knowledge of the bare literal sense was, in the judgment of many, even in those times, thought to be of little use.

Secondly—But it is certain that the original language of the Old Testament was known to very few for the first six centuries, in which those general councils were held, wherein all the articles of the orthodox faith were settled. They governed themselves and determined all their controverted points by the Greek version; and those who knew Hebrew best, whether they took to the mystical or literal way, had the misfortune to be least orthodox. So it was with Origen, who knew the Scriptures so well, that he had them all by heart. And Eusebius and others, who studied and understood the literal sense of the Scriptures best in the next ages, succeeded little better; so that this study seems to have been of little use to the establishment of the orthodox faith. Now, if an exact and critical knowledge of the Scriptures was not necessary to the settling of the faith, it cannot be necessary to the understanding of it, or to the understanding those who have written best on the explication and defence of it. On the contrary, such a knowledge tends to lessen our esteem for the Fathers of the church, by discovering their mistakes; and may weaken our regard to the decisions of councils, by exposing the falseness of the ground they seem to be built upon. A man, well skilled in the literary sense of the Scriptures, will often find, in the Fathers and councils, texts of Scripture urged very insufficiently; and a great stress laid upon passages, which, when critically explained, prove nothing, or perhaps make against them. Which suggests to me a third reason, why it may seem that such a study can do no good.

Thirdly—And that is, because the orthodox faith does not depend upon the Scriptures considered absolutely in themselves, but as explained by catholic tradition. The faith was preserved in creeds,

and handed down from one orthodox bishop to another, whose business it was to keep this sacred *depositum* pure and undefiled, and to deliver it to his successor entire as he received it. It was by this tradition the main articles of faith were preserved in the church, and not from any particular study of the Scriptures. The ground, therefore, of these articles must carefully be distinguished from the Scriptures that have been brought in proof of them; these proofs may be weak and inconclusive, but the truth stands independent of them. It is the faith they have received; and, if at any time they argue weakly for it, from the Scriptures, it is an argument indeed against their learning, but none against their orthodoxy.

This therefore may seem another good argument to prove, that an exact and careful study of the Scriptures is not a safe and profitable study. It is a much safer, as well as a more compendious way to make a man orthodox, to study the traditions of the church.

But you will say, that to send you from Scripture to tradition, is to turn you out of paradise, the garden of God, into a vast, confused, bewildered wood; and this is so far from mending the matter, that it is ten times more laborious than the study I would dissuade you from; and so, I confess, it is, if all the ecclesiastical writers were to be carefully read, in order to know the catholic tradition. But that is not my meaning; the substance of catholic tradition lies in much less compass; the established church, you will allow, is orthodox in all necessary points. If, therefore, you know the sense of the established church, you have in epitome the church catholic; and therefore you need only study her opinions to make you orthodox; and this the most illiterate man may find in the liturgy and articles. This, I trust you will allow, is as short a way as could be wished, of knowing all that is necessary to be known. A very little time will serve a man to read, in his mother tongue, things which altogether would not fill a moderate volume; and he will be orthodox enough, and have a great deal of time to spare for other studies, that will turn to more account. Besides that, it is of great advantage to go in a way that is safe as well as short; and will lead you into the knowledge of all useful truths, without the hazard of falling into any dangerous opinions.

Fourthly—But if you will insist that it is Scripture and not tradition, that the faith is founded on; there is one thing further I must put you in mind of, which may seem to prove, that a profound and laborious study of the Scriptures, will not make you at all more orthodox. It is a fundamental principle among protestants, that whatever is necessary to be believed, is plainly and clearly revealed in the Scriptures; and consequently, what is not plainly and clearly revealed in them, cannot be necessary. Now, if what is plain and clear in Scripture, is the only part that is necessary to be known, then a laborious search into the obscurer parts may seem unnecessary to the obtaining a true orthodox faith. You will say, perhaps, that notwithstanding this declaration of protestants, it may and has been urged

against them by their adversaries, they do believe, and maintain as necessary, articles that cannot be proved by plain and clear passages of Scripture. This, I confess, has been urged, and may possibly be true of all parties of them, except the established church; but, if it be, it proves only that they are not true to their principle; not that the principle is not in itself true and good. And he surely must be allowed to be the best protestant, who adheres best to the principles on which the reformation is founded.

Fifthly—Once more; supposing the study of the Scriptures as necessary as you please; in the last place, I say, and I am sure the world will say it with me, that they have been sufficiently studied already. And if any parts remain still obscure, who can hope to clear up passages that have puzzled so many great men? Or will presume in disputable points to set up his private judgment, against them that were men of more learning, of abler parts, of greater application, and better acquainted with the tradition of the church, than any one will now be allowed to be? And (which is the best guide in knowledge of religion) they were moreover men of most exemplary piety, devotion, and humility; virtues, of which very little footsteps are to be found in the learned men of our times.

Must not now a man have a strong bent of mind indeed, who cannot, by all these reasons, be dissuaded from giving himself up to a study, that may by many be thought as unprofitable as it is laborious; but will go on, in defiance of all that has been said to convince him that he wastes himself in vain, and that there will be no fruits of his labour, but to know he knows nothing? I call that nothing, which will turn to no account.

But, to show you I am disposed to make all possible concessions, I will grant that even this objection might be got over, were this the worst of it; but I have one argument still in reserve, that I am persuaded will be decisive.

(To be continued.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—My object in addressing you is, to request you to give an account of the Bible in one of your future Numbers, as respects its being a *true book*; and upon what grounds it should be believed, as its truths have been disputed by some of the most learned writers and philosophers. Not recollecting to have seen any thing of the kind in your Paper,* I think, by your offering some plain and strong arguments in favour of the truth of this book, it would be interesting to your readers, and have a good effect. I do believe its truths myself, but think by your giving an account of it, it will be beneficial to those who doubt it.

A SUBSCRIBER.

New-York, Sept. 2, 1823.

REMARKS

ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Learned theologians have written and published volumes to prove the genuineness of the Scriptures;

particularly the Old Testament, the truth of which sufficiently guarantees the prominent parts of the New Testament. The Old Testament speaks of a new testament or revelation of God's will, through the medium of one who was to be a "*light, a covenant of the people, salvation,*" &c. The New Testament, so called, contains a record of that "*light and covenant,*" and a narrative of the *appearance* of the *light*; the introduction of a new dispensation, favouring man with new views of God's character and purposes, as manifested through Jesus Christ.

There are two classes of evidence, which we shall distinguish as learned and common. By learned, we mean a knowledge of the transfer of the Book from age to age—a history of its copies and translations—the particular keepers of it—the examination of objections to its authenticity, by a general reference to the works of the most subtle opposers, and elaborate confutations of their positions and assertions. By common, we mean the evidences and proofs which accompany the Book itself, and which are supported by the things therein testified. The last is the property of every honest inquirer after truth; while the first, is more or less confined to those who most need it; from their multiplicity of concerns in the world at large, and exposure to the attacks of infidels and sceptics. To introduce objections to the comparatively ignorant, with a view to strengthen their faith, and extend their views profitably, by the answering of them, is about the same as making a man sick, that he may learn by experience, the art of curing diseases.

We shall not refrain from expressing our opinion, that the perversions and corruptions of the Scriptures, by those who pretend to be their *friends* and advocates, have done more injury to their reputation, than all the writings and objections of all the Deists and sceptics in creation. We even believe the objections of the sceptical, are the consequence of the absurd constructions of the pretended friends of the Book. There is not an honest Deist living, (and we believe there are many worthy honest men among them) who will object to any truth, or any description of the character and purposes of Deity, shown him from the Scriptures, which harmonizes with the book of nature. And we shall venture to add, that there is not an honest enlightened Christian, who will believe the God of Nature to write his own character *differently* at different periods; or to manifest his perfections by a revelation through his prophets, which can in any way *disagree* with the divine impress of the works of his hands.† We therefore respect the man, call him by what *hard names* you may, who will not only doubt but deny the truth of every book and testimony, which represents a God to exist, who is less wise, less good and benevolent, than the God of Nature. The God of Nature is our God—the rack nor the gibbet shall never extort the confession of any other.

What! Not believe in the God of the Scriptures? Reader, if thus you express your alarm, sit down

* We presume our Correspondent has not read the First Volume of the Gospel Herald. Ed.

† Calvinism is black with the odium of charging God with the hypocrisy of deceiving his creatures by a **SECRET WILL**.

again, and compose yourself. Nature and God existed *before* a revelation was made to man; or man was made to receive it. A whole dispensation rolled its ages to oblivion, ere the dispensation of types and shadows commenced, to teach blind man that, which all creation besides, spoke and sung. How beautifully emphatic are the words of the prophet! "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. *There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard.*" Ps. xix. The Scriptures were not given to man to contradict this universal story of God's glory and goodness, but to confirm it; and assist the mind of ignorant man, to scan the works of God, and learn his own origin and destination. Was this necessary? Let the Deist answer; he will say, No! But not more effectually deny the truth, than the Christian, who converts the Bible into a piece of clerical ordnance, to bombard the whole creation.

We consider it indispensable when any thing or principle is to be proved, that the evidence adduced should be comprehensible by, and plain to the mind of, man. Unless the evidences produced can be understood, and the mind receive them without doubt, there can be no conviction. It is the same in fact, if not in form, when the mind is tortured with threatenings, unless a full assent is given, as when the man is stretched upon the rack, and the limbs dislocated in physical agony. In the one case, imagination anticipates exaggerated horrors. In the other, the party realizes the cruel inflictions; and in either, the *misery* of the recipient, and not an enlightened understanding, is to *force* conviction. A just God will never torment his creatures to make them believe, nor make them miserable for not believing. The sufferings incident to this mode of being, which are the result of uncertainty and unbelief, originate with man, and not with his Maker. We have no license nor authority to accuse the Deity of a different feeling towards his offspring in another world. Therefore, however man may be ignorant of particulars, and *blind* to facts, there is abundant testimony of the goodness of God to be seen in his works. His immutability is a sufficient guaranty of his favours. The reproof to blinded Israel is applicable to all men. "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but my people do *not* know, [their owner,] Israel doth *not* consider." If facts corroborate this testimony, the testimony must be true. This will be shown in proper time.

Evidence is considered to be *positive* or *circumstantial*. Strictly speaking, all evidence must come under these two heads; and be considered as common. We frequently hear of a thing being proved to a *demonstration*, when the evidence is not even *positive*. By positive evidence, we mean that which is direct, and has no dependence on circumstances to illustrate, or to confirm it. This necessary distinction, when qualified, as it must be, shows the impossibility of demonstration attending the actions of men. For even what we consider *positive* evi-

dence, is necessarily grounded on a variety of circumstances; and, strange as it may appear, circumstances are the very foundation of what is called *positive* evidence. Demonstrable evidence is that where a *necessity* existed. The necessity of the existence of the thing or principle, therefore, is the only evidence of the fact. In all judicial acts, the mind is swayed by common evidence. Life, limb, liberty, reputation, and, what is sometimes, perhaps, dearer to the party than *all* these, property is staked on the correctness of the ordinary powers and perceptions of men, and sacrificed, to the loss of the party, on ordinary conviction and testimony. Strange incongruity in man. The jury will leave their seats, after having disposed of the *life* of their neighbour, and reject, in their own concern, superior testimony! There never yet, was a man condemned by a jury, to suffer death, unless the jury saw, with their own eyes the criminal perpetrate the crime, who was condemned on so strong evidence as that which supports the genuineness of the Scriptures! This will be seen as we proceed.

It must therefore appear to a reasonable man, that men act in all the common and important concerns of secular, and civil life, with decision, and from the convictions of *common* evidence. Men condemn their fellows, most solemnly, to the death, on the word of others. But, say they, when themselves are the party, and the Scriptures the subject, If God at one period made special communications to men, and received their convictions and assent, as the consequence, why will he not do the same by *us*, if he expects the same from *us*? Must *we* take the evidence or testimony of *others*? We are told that God appeared to Moses, of old, in the bush; let God appear to us, and we will believe as Moses believed. How absurd! Why do you not catechise your witnesses in court, and require of them proof of their sincerity, equal to the pledge given by Moses? His declarations are guaranteed to be truth, by his prophecy of what should happen in your very day, and thousands of years posterior to the time of making them! You never received the word and declarations of an evidence in court, whose testimony was supported by one thousand part of the weight which corroborates the word and declarations of the prophet!

We are addressing the Deist. We know your weakness, and, without vanity, shall say, you cannot defend your hypothesis. Your own inevitable concessions destroy your whole ground and reasoning; and all your objections founded on the absurd doctrines which priests have foisted on the Scriptures, will avail you nothing; neither can we be accountable for them, for we reject them as absurd and wicked.

The fabric of Deism is supported on *two pillars*. Remove them, and the building drops in a moment. First: A revelation, such as the Scriptures, was unnecessary. Second: The Scriptures are not susceptible of proof.

In reply to the first, we appeal to the whole learned world, both living and dead authors, for the acknowledged truth of the fact, that ancient Greece

and Rome, (to say nothing of other cotemporary nations who had arrived to great power, &c.) were not behind, in the sciences and the arts, any people who have come after them. No Deist will have the arrogance to put himself in competition with the sages of antiquity, or to pretend to greater abilities or acquirements. No Deist will deny the fact, of these illustrious nations being miserable slaves to the idolatrous worship of *thousands* of demi-gods! If man, unenlightened by the special inspiration of Heaven, can acquire all the knowledge of the only Supreme God, which is necessary in, and for, this mode of being, how did it happen that Greece and Rome never acquired it? Or will you admit, that your knowledge of God, which as far exceeds the ancients, as the sun's brilliancy exceeds the gleam of the taper, is *unnecessary*? Where did you obtain the knowledge and correct opinions you possess? Were they obtained from the same source the ancients received theirs? If so, if from nature, alone, what made you such wonderful proficient? Reason upon cause and effect, and admit your general deductions, and where will you be?

We advance the position as incontrovertible, that, if the study of nature alone, and the light of nature is sufficient to enlighten the mind of man, man *must* be enlightened by it. The *cause* cannot exist without producing the *effect*. Where no effect is *produced*, we must deny the existence of the *cause* itself. Nature, or the cause, existed for ages. Man remained blind. God's revelation of his word and will, if such a revelation has been made, is a cause, and an effect must result accordingly. We see the effect, in the knowledge which is now diffused even among those whose knowledge of nature, and of the arts and sciences, is far less than the ancients. Will you admit the *effect without a cause*? This you cannot do. You must admit, that the history of man is a history of blind idolaters. Go to Egypt, once the seat of learning, and the nursery of nations, and see human intellect in all its grandeur, bowing to the supremacy of the *ox*! See man, enlightened by nature, in every age, worshipping the *creature*, and deifying stocks and stones. These are facts; let them be accounted for. No Deist will admit that more knowledge is received than is necessary and profitable. This knowledge must be admitted to be an effect of something. The cause, therefore, was necessary, and the cause must be traced to the revelation contained in the Scriptures. Therefore, we come, of necessity, to the truth, that the Scriptures were necessary.

The fact, plainly stated, is this: A knowledge of God and his purposes, obtained through the medium of his works, and the revelation of his word and will, is necessary to ameliorate the condition of man in this life; to learn him his origin, his destination, and the relation in which he stands to God his Creator, and to man his fellow. And we deny, that this knowledge was ever possessed by any nation who were unacquainted with the Scriptures, and who received light, alone, from Nature, or the ordinary works of God. Until some advocate of Deism controverts these premises, their conclusions follow to

the confutation of the declaration, that a revelation, such as the Scriptures, was unnecessary.

(To be continued.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I once in a while have the perusal of some of the numbers of the Gospel Herald, and, indeed, have cursorily perused the first volume and a part of the second, as well as other writings of Universalists. I have also examined the writings of men of other persuasions, that is, of men who do not believe that all the sons and daughters of Adam will finally be made holy and happy. The reading of these writings, has naturally led me to an examination of the Scriptures, in which I find difficulties on both sides. I am sometimes almost led to think that one part of the New Testament clashes with another: and as for the Old Testament I know not much about it, never having read it enough to remember much of its contents.

I have generally attended meetings in my neighbourhood, and carelessly, and I might say, thoughtlessly supposed, that what my preacher told me, was true. But when I came to hear "both sides of the story," I imagined all could not be right, and have therefore set about examining for myself. It is said in the 3d chapter of St. John, that "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given ALL THINGS into his hand." In the first chapter of Hebrews it is said, that he [the Son] is appointed *heir of ALL THINGS*, and in the 2d chapter, it is said *ALL THINGS are for him*. Now it appears to me, that if "ALL THINGS are for him," and that if he has been "appointed heir of ALL THINGS," and that "ALL THINGS are given into his hand," then *all* and *every individual* of the human family must be his; and if they are *his*, according to several passages in the New Testament, it appears that they must eventually be saved. In the 6th chapter of St. John, it is said, "For I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of ALL which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." From this it appears, that if Christ's mission on earth, be not abortive, all the human family will be saved. Again, it is said in the first chapter of Matthew, that "he" [Christ] "shall save his people from their sins," which if true, (and I presume few doubt it) and if *all people are his people*, proves that ALL will finally be happy.

So far Universalism appears plain. But it is said in Romans 8th chapter 9th verse, "Now if *any* man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of *his*." Now it appears to me, that every day's experience proves that there are *thousands* who have not the spirit of Christ; and if they have not, and if I rightly understand this and a number of other passages which I might mention, it appears *possible* that a part of the human race being none of Christ's, may not inherit the kingdom of Heaven. In one place it is said, "Ye are of your father the Devil." Are the devil's children Christ's children? In the 5th chapter of Galatians, at the 20, 21 verses,

there are certain characters described, of whom it is said, "They *shall not* inherit the kingdom of God."

Now, Mr. Editor, what I want of you, is, to explain in your Herald, to me, and perhaps to others, how *all things* can be Christ's, and some men, "*be none of his.*" Show me in what manner the devil's children may be said to belong to Christ; and, if you please, inform me to whom the devil belongs? These things have perplexed me much, and I have never conversed with any one who could give me any thing like satisfaction on the first of them, and as to the others, I have never thought so much upon them, or rather, have never had so much conversation respecting them.

AN INQUIRER.

ANSWER.

Our correspondent is in the same difficulty with thousands. Surely it must occur to him, that the tenor of the testimony which he has quoted, is harmoniously agreeing in the accomplishment of God's purposes in the restoration and glorification of man. The Scriptures, or any book, to be true, must agree in all its parts. Contradictory statements and declarations, are proofs of ignorance or knavery. Nothing can be plainer than this, that, if some men are Christ's, and those who are Christ's shall be saved, and no others, and there are men who are not Christ's, that unless they can become Christ's, they can never be saved. But is this the fact? Do the Scriptures assert this?

Our correspondent has referred us to Rom. viii. 9, "Now if any man have not the *Spirit* of Christ, he is *none of his.*" But, we read this passage differently. "Now if any one have not the *Spirit* of Christ, he is *not of him.*" Not of Christ. It would be abominable to say that an undutiful child, who manifested and cherished a wicked spirit, was of his virtuous and benevolent parent. We understand the apostle as follows—(See the whole verse and connexion.) "Ye are not under the dominion of the flesh (the earthly man,) but of the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God (which is love) dwell in you. But, if any one is not exercised by the Spirit of Christ, he is not of him," Christ. Who are they of? We answer—The devil. When the devil and his works are destroyed, all will be of Christ; as Christ is of God! A glorious consummation.

We do not know how to show our correspondent in what manner the devil's children belong to Christ. We believe Christ will never own the *devil's* children; but only "*every man*" for whom he tasted death. As to the devil, we declare that we will not own him; we dare not call him the property of God, for he never made a devil; and we respect our brethren of the human race too much, to call him their property. Our opinion is, that every one would be ashamed to own him. He is a mischievous thing, and as he is to be destroyed, as nothing worth, we will say no more about him.

INFINITY OF SIN.

The modern doctrine that sin is *infinite*, is beset with difficulties, view it in what shape you will. But its absurdity glares monstrosly when we recur

to the divine testimony, and the declarations of the prophets and apostles of God. Paul declares, that "the creation was made *subject to vanity*;" that is, a sinful state. Admit the infinity of sin, and also admit the declaration of Paul to be true, and you accuse the Creator of subjecting man to a state of *infinite evil*! Who is so blind as not to see the abominable tendency of this modern hypothesis? Alas! Thousands who are in the prison of Calvinistic darkness, or bound fast with the chains of Hopkinsian error. We rejoice that this wicked and foolish dogma of modern invention, is fast verging to the shades of oblivion.

EXCOMMUNICATION.

On Sunday afternoon last, a boy was excommunicated from a Sunday School in this city, in due form, and with a loud and terrible voice, for the awful crime of not going to church in the forenoon. The scholars were charged to hold no manner of intercourse with the vile boy, who had not been to meeting. A hearer represents the scene to have been one of true ecclesiastical grandeur, and partaking of the root and essence of pious tyranny. It therefore appears, that the correction of habits which are a real injury, and the enlightening of the understanding of the party, is not the design. It is to coerce the children to become partisans to the creeds of men, and to perpetuate the present state of things in the religious world. Some of these schools may be conducted properly; but we express an opinion, that our city or country will not be benefited by the exercise of *petty tyranny*; nor the morals of the community be hedged in by threats of fire and brimstone.

NEW PUBLICATION.

We have received the first number of a new work entitled "EVANGELICAL REPERTORY," edited by EDWARD TURNER, Pastor of the Universalist church in Charlestown, and to be published in Charlestown, (Mass.) monthly, in a pamphlet of 16 pages, octavo.

NOTICE.

The members of the "Second Society of United Christian Friends" in this city, are informed, that the Society will meet every Tuesday evening, at 7 o'clock, at Mr Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street. The members of the Society are requested to be punctual in their attendance.

KNEELAND'S TESTAMENT.

For Sale at this Office, The New Testament, in Greek, Greek and English, and English. The Greek according to Griesbach; the English upon the basis of the fourth London edition of the Improved Version, with an attempt to farther improvement from the translations of Campbell, Wakefield, Scarlett, Macknight, and Thompson. By Abner Kneeland, Minister of the First Independent Church of Christ, called Universalist, in Philadelphia. The Greek and English in 2 vols. Price—Greek, \$ 3. Greek and English, \$ 4. Do. in calf, \$ 4 50, English, \$ 1 50. Do. in calf, \$ 1 75.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1823.

NO. 20.

On the Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures.

BY BISHOP HARE.

(Continued from page 169.)

My 2d argument then is this, that a painful, exact, impartial study of the Scriptures, will, by some, be thought not only to do no good, but also a great deal of hurt, both to the public and to yourself.

First—It will do hurt to the public. It will disturb the peace of the church, and that cannot but have a malignant influence on the state.

It is certain that disputes in the church disturb the peace of it; and it is as certain these disputes have been as generally raised by men pretending to a superior knowledge of the Scriptures, and to discoveries that have escaped others. The Scriptures have always been made this use of by the heretics of old; and it is the character of the great heretics of this and the last age, who have set up for a free and impartial search into the literal sense of the Scriptures above the rest of the christian world. But with what success? They have purchased their pretended knowledge of the Scriptures at the expense of their reputation, and their study has destroyed their orthodoxy. And were not their books and opinions carefully suppressed, and their persons rendered odious to the people, who knows what disturbances they might have created to the church? On the other hand, the peace the church has enjoyed for many years, among its own members, seems to be owing to no one thing more, than to a general neglect of this study; and the dangers, that at present threaten its tranquility, come wholly from men who have endeavoured to revive a study that has so often proved pernicious to its peace.

Nor can it well be otherwise; for what security has a man that sets out in this way; that attempts to study the Scriptures in a free and impartial manner, laying aside all prepossessions and previous notions, resolving to see with his own eyes, and judge for himself, and to believe nothing that he is not, upon his own search, convinced is clearly contained within them? What security has such a man, that he shall not fall into some opinions that have been already condemned as erroneous and heretical, or which may interfere with those that are commonly received; which, if they do not immediately strike at any fundamental point, yet will be thought to do so; and may have a tendency to put scruples into weak minds, and to disturb the peace of the church, by raising doubts about the meaning or truth of some articles, or by asserting that an explicit belief of them is not necessary? It is so natural for curious and inquisitive minds to deviate

from the common road, and the examples are so many, that it is odds but you do so too, unless you have more lead in your constitution, or a more refined understanding, than any curious man ever had yet; otherwise you cannot be sure, that you shall not study yourself into doubts at least, if not into opposite opinions concerning some received notions. You will doubt perhaps of the authority or author of some canonical book, and think perhaps that some passages are interpolated, or that some celebrated texts are not genuine, or should be otherwise read, or have not been rightly understood, or do not prove the point they are commonly brought for. You may fall into notions that will be thought tending to Arianism, or the like; you may reject arguments brought from the Old Testament, to prove the trinity, as trifling, and proving nothing but the ignorance of those that make use of them. You may think a prophecy has a literal meaning, where commonly the mystical is thought the only one. You may think that many texts in the New Testament, which are strong against the Socinians, do not prove against the Arian notion. That the title, Son of God, has not always one uniform meaning in the Gospel; and that that single expression, of itself, is no proof of any thing in God analogous to generation in men. That the identical consubstantiality of the Son, the eternal procession of the Spirit, and many other notions relating to the trinity, though they may be true in themselves, are not so in virtue of the texts alleged for them. These notions learned men have fallen into; and from thence it is to be presumed, you will not easily keep clear of them. I choose to instance chiefly in matters relating to the trinity, because it is the controversy now on foot; but the like may be said on many other articles; in each of which the truth is but one, but the errors infinite; and there is hardly any notion, with respect to any of them, which some learned man, by following his own private judgment, instead of taking the doctrine of the church for his guide, has not fallen into.

Now, if you should study yourself into any new opinions, or into old ones that have been condemned, what will you do? Will you keep them to yourself or publish them? Or shall I rather say, it is no question. The authors of new notions are apt to be very fond of them; they think it barbarous and cruel, to stifle the infant in its birth. There is a secret pleasure in singularity; to differ from the vulgar is, in appearance, to be above them; and to be distinguished from the herd, is too great a temptation to be easily resisted. But, had you prudence enough to govern your ambition, conscience may

come in here, and make you do what ambition could not. The truths you think you have discovered, either are, or will be thought by you, of too much importance to the honour of God and the good of religion, to be concealed. You will look on them as the blessings of God on your studies; and think it a capital crime to extinguish the light, and suppress the knowledge he has imparted to you. In short, you will think yourself under the highest obligation not to dissemble in religious matters, and conceal, from the church of God, opinions which you are convinced are not only true, but of great service to it. Let me then conclude, that the novel or revived opinions, which your study leads you into, will be published to the world; what now will be the consequence? Certain mischief, but no certain good at all. No good, I say; for possibly your notions may be wrong, or not of consequence; and whether they are or not, the presumption against you will be so strong, that your notions will not be received, and perhaps not examined; they will be condemned as novel notions, or as exploded ones; and, whatever you advance, it will be thought a certain proof of its being of no consequence, that in so many ages it has never been received. There is no room therefore to expect, that what you advance should be received, or do any good. But the mischief is sure and certain; it will raise scruples in weak, unstable minds, sap the foundations of the orthodox faith, and give a handle to skeptical men; who, because some things are called into doubt (though incidental matters only, and of little consequence) will think they have a right from thence to question every thing. Thus the church and established faith will suffer by the scruples put into its friends, and the handle given to its enemies. And when religious disputes are begun, designing men know how to intermix affairs of state with them; and then nobody knows where it will end, or what mischiefs it may do. Whereas, if you can be content to go in the beaten road; if you will implicitly submit to the received notions, and humbly think the judgment of the church, where it is not the same, better than your own, you will be out of harm's way, and neither hurt the church nor yourself.

Secondly—I add yourself, as another motive that ought to have great weight with you in this question; for you cannot disturb the peace of the church, without being greatly a sufferer yourself. If you really do not disturb its peace, it is all one, you will be interpreted to do it, and that will bring on you more evils than I would wish to my greatest enemy. In a word, you will be thought a *heretic*; a term which there is a strange magic in, though it has no determinate meaning in the mouth of the people, nor any ill meaning in itself. It is supposed to include in it every thing that is bad; it makes every thing appear odious and deformed; it dissolves all friendships, extinguishes all former kind sentiments, however just and well deserved; and, from the time a man is deemed a heretic, it is charity to act against all rules of charity; and, the more they violate the laws of God in dealing with

him, it is, in their opinion, doing God the greater service!

That you may not think this is said at random, purely to frighten you into a compliance with me, let me desire you to consider seriously the natural consequences of being under the imputation of heresy. And the first I would observe is, that, from the moment your people have this opinion of you, you are incapacitated from working much good upon them; and that, I am sure, so good a man as you are, must think to be a great evil. While they think you orthodox, your virtuous and inoffensive behaviour, your strict sobriety and temperance, your affable and familiar manner of conversing with them, your generous and charitable regard to those who are sick or in distress; these good qualities, joined to your plain and easy, but affectionate and moving manner of instructing them, have a mighty influence, and you may lead them as you please; they admire and endeavour to imitate your good example; your virtuous conduct is a constant, though tacit, reproof when they do amiss; the very sight of you is a lecture of virtue to them; and the influence you have already had, in the little time you have been among them, is too visible to be denied. But, from the time you are called heretic, much of the good you could have done, is at an end. Those, who before had a secret veneration of you, think it their duty to defame and injure you; your virtue, they call hypocrisy; your humility, spiritual pride; they look on you as an abandoned wretch; that God has withdrawn his grace, and that the devil is at the bottom of all you have been doing; that nothing can better testify their orthodoxy, than to throw off all regard both to your doctrine and example; and, for fear they should seem to be infected with your errors, they will return to the vices you had persuaded them to leave; and, for the future, will take effectual care not to be the better for you.

Nobody can do much good, whom the people do not think a good man; and that cannot be expected, when so much reproach and infamy will, right or wrong, be heaped upon you, if you do not continue orthodox. And this you cannot doubt, if you will but reflect upon what passes under your own eyes; and therefore it is in vain to fancy your virtue will protect you. No, the most conspicuous virtue will not be believed. If you are guilty of no open vices, secret ones will be imputed to you; your inquiries will be called vain, curious, and forbidden studies. Pride and ambition will be said to be the secret springs of them; a search after truth will be called a love of novelty; the doubting of a single text will be skepticism; the denial of an argument, a renouncing of the faith. To say what the Scriptures have said, and in the very same words too, if not explained in the common way, will be blasphemy; and the most severe concern for the honour of Almighty God, you cannot be sure, will not be interpreted downright atheism. Every thing you say, or do, will have a wrong turn given it. A slip of memory shall be made wilful prevarication; a mistake in a citation shall be forgery and corruption;

an error in an incidental point of learning, shall be a good proof that you know nothing. Every inaccurate expression shall be pressed into a crime; any little warmth of temper shall be aggravated into pride, and positiveness into a contempt of authority and ill manners. In short, all the indiscretions of a man's former life, shall be ripped up, and nothing forgiven, that can be remembered or strained to his disadvantage. And where is the man that can be fond of such usage? For my part, I am free to declare, I am afraid I should not have virtue or courage enough to undergo the fiery trial.

Now all this a man will draw upon himself, that brings himself under the imputation of heresy. Whereas the orthodox man lives quiet and at ease, unmolested and unenvied. His faults (and who has not some!) shall be extenuated or excused, if not quite buried in oblivion; his want of temper shall be a commendable zeal; his indiscretion, good nature; his mistakes shall be imputed to haste or inadvertency; and, when they cannot be defended, it will be regarded in his favour, that the greatest men sometimes err, and the writers of the first rank are not always in the right; or perhaps a mistake shall turn to his advantage; it will be shown to be an error on the right side, and that a good cause drew him into it. His learning, on the other hand, shall be magnified beyond measure; every body will be full of his good qualities, and his virtues shall be set in the best light to show themselves and cover his faults. In a word, orthodoxy atones for all vices, and heresy extinguishes all virtues. That this is nothing but the bare truth, I appeal to what you every day hear and see yourself.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS

ON THE GENUINENESS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

(Concluded from p. 151.)

We shall now examine the second position, or pillar of Deism. "The Scriptures are not susceptible of proof."

Although much might be said of the internal evidence which the Book carries with it, and which is best understood and appreciated by those who understand and believe it, we shall dispense with it altogether. When *one* incontrovertible evidence can be produced, it is unnecessary to call twenty. Unequivocal proof, which has even the concessions of its opposers for a foundation, cannot be lightly esteemed. And such we consider the nation of Jews or Israelites, scattered abroad over the face of the earth. We have already remarked on cause and effect; and now produce the dispersed Jews, a fact without a likeness or a parallel, as an *effect*, and ask the *cause*? We also produce the Book called the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, with the *prophecy*, which it contains, relative to the dispersion of the Jews, which prophecy the Deist is obliged to admit was written and uttered thousands of years anterior to the present event, which it describes with the most minute exactness; and we demand the *cause* of this, which, it must be admitted, is an *effect* of something.

We are not addressing *Atheists*; and we doubt whether such *fools* exist, who are compelled continually to deny the evidences of their own senses; but Deists, men who acknowledge that the existence of an *effect*, proves, incontrovertibly, the prior existence of a cause. There must be an *affinity* between cause and effect, whose laws must have order and measure, and we must acknowledge this, or become fools at once. The dispersion of the Jews, is an effect of something. No one will deny the affinity which exists, between the fact, and the prophecy of the fact; and the prophecy must be the middle link in the chain, and the affinity is hereby visible, whereby we trace the effect to its first antecedent cause. Unless resort is had to Atheism, the Supreme Governour of the Universe must be admitted to have ordered and controlled this event. No Deist can escape from this conclusion; because his every day decisions and opinions will condemn him. If it be said, the dispersion of the Jews, and their retaining their national and religious peculiarities, is only the effect of habits firmly rooted when their progenitors dwelt in Palestine, we answer—Prove this, by evidence as conclusive as that we produce to substantiate the contrary, and we will believe it. But, you will remember, no evidence is adduced; not even a parallel case, to prove, not the probability, but, the *possibility* of the fact. There is a most harmonious agreement in the history of man, to the present day; proving that all the world, the Jews excepted, have experienced similar vicissitudes. We find "there is nothing new under the sun." The prophecy of the Jew's dispersion, and its accomplishment, are older than Deism itself!

Now consider Deism as an effect, strongly and distinctly marked from the Polytheism of the ancients, and trace it to its cause. If its origin and first location cannot be identified and stated with precision, there is an acknowledged fact, which speaks volumes against the principle itself. It is this: Deism is posterior to the Scriptures, which contain the prophecy alluded to. And no Deist was ever found where the Scriptures were unknown. Consequently, Deism was generated in a war of opposition to the Scriptures; and the light which illumines the Deists' mind, was elicited in the combat. Look at the ancients, the philosophers and sages, and the intelligent part of the nations. What shall we argue from their worship, and the multiplicity of their gods? Not Deism. For the Deist denies the existence of a plurality of gods. What can we infer? That the minds of the ancients were sufficiently enlightened? No! For they were continually groping amid conflicting opinions, and increasing the number of their gods and their sacrifices, as contingencies wore unpromising appearances.

We ask, whether the condition of man is meliorated by the knowledge of the Scriptures? The Deist must admit the truth of the declaration, that his condition, as respects his knowledge of God, and the relation in which he stands to God, and to man his fellow, is far superior to that of the ancients. Is it not reasonable to suppose, that a beneficent and good God, will make such communications to his

creatures, of Himself, as shall be necessary and conducive to their well-being, in this world, and that his character of a beneficent and good Being, would suffer, in the eye of reason and humanity, in default of doing it? Whatever may be the cause of the creature's blindness, the Creator has permitted the existence of the cause; and reason must say, that the blindness will not be permitted to exist to the injury of the creature. That God will, according to His own wisdom, remove all evil, and perfect the happiness of his creatures. Uncertainty of the future will always poison the joys of the present passing hour. The Scriptures testify of God's purpose relative to man, and vindicate God's character from the charge of cruelty and indifference towards man His offspring.

But will the Scriptures be believed? Is it not necessary that some striking evidence should exist of their truth or genuineness, that man may confide in their testimony? We answer, Yes: for that evidence does exist. Supposing the Deists of the present age had lived when the Deity was about commencing His revelation of His word and will, through the medium of His prophets, and the Deists had been consulted relative to the kind and quantity of evidence which should be caused to exist, and to accompany the revelation about to be made, what could they have suggested superior to the present? Had their opinion been asked,—

If a prophecy of the whole condition, history, and concerns of a nation of men, distinct from all others, and contrary to the ordinary events of human life, and to be retained and handed down by this nation from father to son, through a long course of generations, and by them preserved, although it perpetuated the story of the cause of their disgrace, and identified them as those who should become a by-word among the nations of the earth, and this, contrary to all precedent, and without a parallel, whether this would not be sufficient evidence of the truth and genuineness of the prophecy, &c.? Could they have replied—

No! It will not be good evidence; for it will be reasonable to suppose, some thousand years hence, if the prophecy should be proved to be true, by the happening of the events stated, that it was mere *guess work*. A reply to this effect, would be an outrage upon every rational principle. And now to deny the testimony, supported as it is, by this prophecy, and these facts, is not less an outrage!

Mankind, whether Deists or not, well know, that no human knowledge can penetrate the vail which hides even to-morrow from our view. That to undertake to foretell, to the precision of every particular, the condition and location of a nation of men, for thousands of years to come, would of all undertakings be the most preposterously foolish, ridiculous, and absurd. And to predict the condition of that nation, to be *different* from all other nations who have lived in this world, and dissimilar in all respects, would, if possible, increase the absurdity. We are compelled by weight of testimony to say, that human foresight and judgment could never have conceived and planned events, the happening

of which could have supported the authority and genuineness of the Scriptures, as the *prophecy* of, and dispersion of the Jews have done. There is no nation in want of the evidence, who are in possession of the testimony. The Scriptures are attested by the Jews, and the Jews identified by the Scriptures. They go hand in hand; and the evidence is, to an unprejudiced mind, *perfectly irresistible*. It is the greatest the mind can conceive. Ordinary proofs dwindle into insignificance when compared with the mountain of evidence which supports the Sacred Book. We believe, the man who rejects this evidence, cannot be convinced by any other. And that no Deist ever was, nor ever will be convinced by any other. To adduce other evidence to support and corroborate this, would be like propping a fabric with *straws*, whose foundation is composed of pillars of *adamant*.

The ignorant and bigoted zealot, may console himself with the thought that he is doing God service, when he is slandering the Deist, and misconstruing his principles; when, in fact, he is only giving vent to his ill nature, and exposing his own ignorance. We know of no class of men, whose principles, or whose want of principle, will authorize any person whatever to indulge in slanderous invective. It is however, a lamentable fact, that even many well disposed people, from ignorance and prejudice, have been led to slander Deists most unmercifully. Take the celebrated Thomas Paine, for example, a man of whom too much *evil* could not be said, and of whom, also, it was dangerous to speak well. The time has been, when in some sections of our country, the religious part of the community would approve of every kind of slander uttered against Paine, because he was a *Deist*. They would almost outlaw a man who should dare to admit that Paine possessed one good quality, or principle, or performed one, comparatively, good action. If a man is very bad, and possesses very few qualities which are meritorious, the greater the necessity that he should be credited for what he does possess. The old vulgar adage is a good one—"Give the devil his due."

Mr. Paine's obstinate hostility to the Scriptures, and his deistical writings generally, were sufficient evidence of an untractable mind, and of bigoted infidelity. (For a Deist can be as great a bigot as a Calvinist.) But, if we admit the reasoning and conclusions of Paine's most bitter enemies, and take the *death bed* as the criterion, we must award a greater meed of praise to Paine, than to some of his titled and Reverend calumniators. On this head, if we admit the affinity between cause and effect, and believe the assertions of the orthodox, that the death bed will test a man's principles, Paine's Deism answered a much better purpose, and stood the hour of trial in a superior manner to the Calvinist's Calvinism. It is a *fact*, notwithstanding the orthodox slanders to the contrary, that Paine, although a Deist, and a vulgar one too, manifested more composure, and expressed firmer hopes, than some of the reverend and distinguished Doctor's of Divinity have done on that trying occasion. For they

have died in the *dark*, and manifested their unbelief by terrific fears, and appalling apprehensions of futurity. Not so with Paine. In reply to a friend, who interrogated him just before he died, relative to his principles and his views, he said, "He was willing to trust God for the *future*, for he had given him sufficient evidence of His love and goodness in the *past*." This sentiment, let it come from whom it may, and on any occasion, is worthy of the Christian's approbation. Thomas Paine, *of course*, died in dreadful horror, on—*paper*! Catchpenny publications slandered him, and imposed on the credulity of the pious public.

This, which the reader will consider a digression, we offer, not to the memory of a Deist, but, as an *apology* for our country, where the most abominable and wicked slanders have not only been tolerated, but praised and approved. Thomas Paine was a foolish misguided man, when he ventured his philippics against the Scriptures. These impotent efforts betrayed as much spleen and ignorance, as his political writings abounded with manly, and honourable, and just conceptions of the *rights of man*. The one, elevated him, and placed him high in the esteem of the wise and good; while the other precipitated him to the lowest abyss of vulgarity and folly.

We conclude, by repeating and applying a sentiment of Plutarch. "I had rather," said he, "that posterity should deny that Plutarch ever existed, than they should admit that I had lived, and was cruel, malicious, and revengeful." "The fool," says the prophet, "hath said in his heart, *there is no God*." And we say, that it requires a greater and worse than a *fool*, to admit his *being*, and viewing the numerous evidences of his goodness and beneficence, at the same time, attribute to Him the most malicious passions, and accuse Him of the most abominable and cruel purposes.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

Number 14, of the GOSPEL HERALD, contains our reply to some questions asked us, by Mr. Woodworth, Editor of the NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY, and a number of interrogations, on our part, for the accommodation of our friend W. and his readers. The following is Mr. W.'s answer, &c. as published in his last Number.

"THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"In the last number of the '*Missionary*,' we took notice of some observations which had appeared in the *Gospel Herald* respecting the doctrines of the *New-Jerusalem*. In doing this we asked the Editor (Mr. Fitz) several questions, to some of which he returned a respectful and courteous reply, which will be found below, and which we feel bound to publish, as he 'fairly and candidly' gave our remarks a place in his paper. Other assailants, who have done the same, will not find in us an ungenerous or an unfair opponent. But those, who (like the Editor of the *Observer*, published in Salem, Mass.) are so destitute of fairness and candour, as wilfully and wickedly to *misrepresent* (instead of *publishing*) our reply to their illiberal attacks, will hereafter be considered as only worthy of our sincere pity. And

here we cannot help observing, that let a religious controversy be conducted, on both sides, in the spirit which characterizes the following remarks of Mr. Fitz, and the result cannot be unfavourable to the cause of spiritual truth."

[Here follows our reply, &c. for which, see G. H. No. 14. p. 109.]

"REMARKS.

"We readily plead guilty to the charge of ignorance of Mr. F.'s doctrine, if the *power of God to make men good and happy, without any co-operation on their part*, be not one of them. All that we contended for was, that a being who really possesses such a power, is cruel and unjust if he does not exercise it, and thereby render his creatures '*perpetually happy in this world, as well as in the next*,' every moment here as well as eternally hereafter. To borrow the figure adopted by Mr. F., that surgeon would be cruel and unjust who inflicted a moment's pain in the amputation of a limb, *if* he had power to prevent it.

"But the scriptures nowhere attribute *such* a power to God. They represent Him as being governed by the eternal laws of divine order, from which he can no more deviate than he can cease to be God. They promise no salvation without co-operation. 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.' All the exhortations of both the Old and New Testaments imply this indispensable condition. 'For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength: *and ye would not*.' Isaiah xxx. 15. What was the consequence of their refusal? Dispersion and ruin; they were 'left as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill,' to warn others against disobedience.

"Let it not be contended that this exhortation, and others we may adduce, if they be truly *scripture*, were intended *exclusively* for the Jewish nation, because an apostle expressly says, '*All scripture* is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

"Again. 'Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye *die*, O house of Israel?' From these words it is evident that the *consequence* of not turning from their evil ways, would inevitably be *death* of some sort or other; and yet in the first part of the same verse the Lord says—'As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the *death* of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and *live*.' Ezekiel, xxxiii. 11.

"Again, in the same prophet—'Repent, and turn from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your *ruin*.' xviii. 30. So, in Jeremiah, iv. 14. 'O Jerusalem, wash thy heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved.' 'My people *would not* hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts' lust; and they walked in their own counsels. O that my people *had* hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked

in my ways; I should soon have subdued their enemies,' &c. Psalm, lxxxi. 11, 12, 13. 'They would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof: therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way.' Prov. i. 30, 31. 'Turn ye unto me, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will turn unto you, saith the Lord of Hosts.' Zech. i. 3. 'Wash ye, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well.' What will be the consequence of such *co-operation* on the part of man? It will be this: 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.' Isaiah, i. 16—20.

"If all these passages be really and truly *scripture*, let it be borne in mind that they were given for 'doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;' and that these 'things are an *allegory*,' and 'are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.' No one, we presume, will say, that the exhortations of the Word of God were written merely to avert *temporal* calamities; we might as well say that the work of redemption was for no higher end.

"Again, in the New Testament—Jesus Christ, the *omnipotent* Redeemer, (into whose hands *all power* was given, in heaven and earth,) shed tears of divine compassion over 'the devoted city of Jerusalem, because she had so obstinately and so *successfully* resisted the exertion of his Almighty power to make her happy: 'O Jerusalem! Jerusalem!' he exclaimed, in the plenitude of his divine mercy, 'how often *would I* have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not*.'

"Was not the *will* of the Lord, in this instance, defeated by the perverseness and obstinacy of man? And yet 'all things were made by him,' and are still upheld 'by the word of his power,' while he pleads in vain with his perverse erring children—'Ye *will not* come unto me, that ye may have life.' 'As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the *death* of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and *live*. Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye *die*?'

"Mr. Fitz may give his own signification to the death here spoken of; for it must mean either the death which Paul speaks of, when he says, 'sin revived and I died;' or the death of the body; or what is called eternal death: One or all of these deaths the wicked must die, unless he turn from the evil of his ways: and the Lord swears by himself that it is his pleasure the wicked should turn and *live*. But as no one will pretend that all sinners do turn from their evil ways in this world, the will of the Lord is either defeated, or the death spoken of must be beyond the grave. The Universalist may take either side of this triangular dilemma he chooses, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' Gen. ii. 17. If the sinner, in this case, did die, God either could or could not have prevented

it. If he *could*, and did *not*, we cannot reconcile his character with our ideas of justice or mercy.

"We have said thus much to convince Mr. F. that our doctrines do not attribute any more *impotence* to the divine being, than the doctrines of every church must, in which the *freedom of the human will* is admitted. The hacknied quotation of 'thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power,' has no longer any weight; for even the most ignorant have been informed that the words *shall be* are not in the original. An erasure of these words deprives the passage, at once, of that emphatical and indicative character which has been lent to it for the sole purpose of giving support to a darling doctrine. When the Lord speaks (by the mouth of David) of the *day of his power*, it is universally admitted he refers to the last judgment, when the wicked spirits were to be separated from the good. In doing this, his *enemies*, or the spirits of the wicked, were to be made his footstool; while his *people*, or the spirits of the righteous, *willingly* acknowledge him as their king, 'in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning.'" (To be continued.)

REPLY.

Mr. Woodworth has very ingeniously *evaded* answering our questions, and politely mistaken about the whole of our argument. We must, therefore, again invite his attention to a few particulars. Preparatory to this, however, as he concludes his remarks by saying, "We ask for *information*," we shall take the liberty of remarking, that, as the wisest men have been stigmatized as fools, and fools have found their eulogists, if we can obtain *information*, and exercise candour in treasuring it in a willing mind, it will be productive of more lasting good, than any eulogium, however well deserved, for finesse in evasion; or address in obstinate contentions about trifles. We declare, that we possess no error which we will not gladly exchange for truth. With us, preconceived opinions, however dearly bought, or strenuously supported, shall no longer be our opinions than they can be supported by *reason*, and have the current of revelation in their favour. But, we must have *reason* and *revelation*, not a something else as a substitute. We hope Mr. W. will be found possessing too much candour and honesty, to deny his own premises and their conclusions; and will have sufficient love of the truth, to prevent him from urging us to embrace shadows in the stead of our own substantial sentiments. After expressing our regret, that Mr. W. was not as punctual in replying to our interrogations, as he was friendly in his observations preceding his reply, we proceed to notice his remarks.

Mr. W. in his first paragraph, declares his readiness to be considered ignorant of our doctrines, "if the *power of God to make men good and happy, without any co-operation on their part*, be not one of them." We presume Mr. W. means by *co-operation*, "the *labouring jointly* with another to the same end; the concurring in the same effect." Now the question arises, *How* will "God make man good and happy?" It is first proper to inquire, "In what does goodness and happiness consist?" Mr. W.

we think will concur in our reply, that it consists in being *like God*, and participating, with him, in his perfections. We prove this, by the declaration that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." For, says Paul, "Behold I show you a mystery; [till then a secret,] We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be *changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*, and we shall be *changed*." (1 Cor. xv. 50-52.) Now, it is impossible for a man to become good and happy, unless God makes him good and happy, and by the above process, &c. We, therefore, ask Mr. W. how, and in what manner, does *man co-operate* with God, when man is, in a moment, *changed* from being corruptible and mortal, to *incorruptibility and immortality*? Will the *joint labour of man with God*, during the moment, the twinkling of an eye, when this great work shall be performed, be indispensable to *enable* God to accomplish it? Will not man be "*good*," when he shall be raised in the "*heavenly image*?" and "*happy*," when "this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality;" when "*Death is swallowed up in victory*?"

We think Mr. W. must answer in the affirmative. It remains with him, therefore, to show, how man is to "labour jointly" with God, in effecting this change. To Mr. W. we say, Be careful, lest you make a God of man, and a man, of God. Now our doctrine teaches (for it is the Scripture itself,) that man is not a "joint labourer," but the humble *recipient* of God's goodness! If Mr. W.'s doctrine teaches more than this, and contends that man must be a "joint labourer" with God, to *enable* God to do the work, it is not the Scripture doctrine. Mr. W. can now see the propriety of inquiring, Why God does not make his offspring, man, incorruptible, before he is corruptible? Immortal, before he is mortal? And giving him the heavenly image, before he has the earthly image. Or, if you please, make man corruptible and incorruptible; mortal and immortal, earthly and heavenly, at the same time! This we think, to borrow figures from Mr. W., would be like "making *square circles*, and contiguous *hills* without a *valley* between them."

Mr. W. commences his *second* paragraph by saying, "But the Scriptures nowhere attribute such a power to God," &c. [The power of making men happy without their co-operation.] "They promise no salvation without man's co-operation. 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,'" &c. We ask, Is not the being raised *immortal*, &c. a *salvation*? And we again ask, How does man co-operate in the raising of himself, in a moment, (that is, a moment's co-operation!) from mortality to immortality?

Again: Let reason speak. *When* was the life to be enjoyed, which was to be possessed on keeping the commandments? Ans. When the party *kept* the commandments. Has any man, Christ excepted, ever kept the commandments of God, in this mode of being? Answer—No! For we read, "He that

offendeth in *one point*, is guilty of *all*," and, "in many things, we offend all." Now we will acknowledge, that if any man really *keeps* the commandments, he shall "enter into *life*." But, alas! man, in this mode of being, never was able to co-operate, as Mr. W. would say, with God, and therefore, the apostle says, "Flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God."

Again: Let us apply Mr. W.'s "*co-operation*" to the following—Heb. viii. 10-12. "For, this *is* the covenant [*testament, will*,] that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins, and their iniquities will I remember no more." Are we to understand by the above, when God says "I will, and they shall," that man shall assist jointly, &c? Surely Mr. W. must admit, that all shall know God; whether by their co-operation, or by God's putting his laws into their minds, and writing them in their hearts.

Mr. W.'s *third* to the *eighth* paragraph, inclusive, is made up of quotations relative to the disobedience of the Jews while under the law, previous to the Christian era. Now, the covenant we have quoted from Heb. viii. is for the very people who violated the law! According to Mr. W.'s quotation from the prophet, the consequence of disobedience, is not punishment in another world, but to "be devoured by the *sword*." And Mr. W.'s conclusion, that *temporal* calamities were not intended, &c. is not supported by any thing but his opinion. Now we think, that the work of salvation was intended for a higher end. Even for an end as high as heaven, and to bring immortality to man.

Mr. W. asks, in the case of Jerusalem, "Was not the *will* of the Lord, in this instance, *defeated*, by the perverseness of *man*?" Are we to infer, that the Lord made an attempt to save Jerusalem, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem would not *co-operate*, and therefore beat the Lord? Pray, how many wills do you suppose the Lord has, relative to the same event? Will you admit, that it was God's will not to have Jerusalem destroyed, and that God was disappointed in the destruction of that city? Did God know that Jerusalem would be destroyed, and will a different event, from that which he knew would happen? Or, if, as you say, man's *co-operation* is necessary, did not God know that He could do nothing, without man's assistance? If so, did not God will to preserve Jerusalem, on condition of man's *co-operation*? If man had co-operated with the Lord's will, and if Jerusalem had been preserved to this day, would not Christ have lived to a good old age, the temple now lifted its gilded spires, and sacrifices now smoked on its altars? Would not the prophecies have proved false, and God's declarations, to his prophets, have turned out to be a mere fable? In fine, is it not incongruous to say, that God exer-

cised "*Almighty* power to make her happy," (Jerusalem) and this *almighty* power was not sufficient, because man's *more than almighty* power was not brought into successful "co-operation?" You say, that "*all* power, in heaven and in earth, was given to Jesus Christ." Surely, if Christ had *all* power, none could have remained for man to "*co-operate* and successfully resist" Christ. Is it not very strange to talk of poor man, a mere worm of the dust, who cannot exist for a moment without the help of God, "*successfully resisting Almighty power*?" We are astonished at this mode of reasoning! Look again at this strange hypothesis. Man "*lives, and moves, and has his being in God*;" God is *Almighty*, and God has not *might enough* to save man, unless man, who has no might but that which he receives from God, *co-operates* with God! Is it possible for a worm, a mere nothing, of itself, to withstand *Almighty power*? If it is, we then stand aghast—we gaze with astonishment on all around us, and must not wonder if eternal confusion reigns, and God should be dethroned by man. What absurdities grow out of error! Admit your doctrine. It is God's will that I shall die. Now, unless I *co-operate*, God will be "*successfully resisted*," and I shall live to the age of Methuselah. It is God's will that I shall be raised at the resurrection of man. I will not do any thing about it, and no resurrection happens.

Mr. W. in his *ninth* paragraph, speaking of the death of the wicked, says, "It must mean either the death which Paul speaks of," &c. "or the death of the *body*; or, what is called *eternal death*," &c. We should like to know who it is, who calls the death "*eternal death*." We must have some authority for this. We deny that there is such a thing as *eternal death*, which man can possibly be subject to! Consequently Mr. W.'s "*triangle*" is broken! There is no side for us to take. We shall remain standing between two parallel lines, at liberty to step over and view them as we please. However, to accommodate Mr. W., we will consider of that which is left. Mr. W. quotes Gen. ii. 17, saying, "If the sinner, in this case, did die, God either could or could not have prevented it. If he *could*, and did *not*, we cannot reconcile his character with our ideas of justice or mercy." This is plain. Let us see what we can do. Mr. W. must admit that the sinner, man, could or could not have prevented the sinning, and the dying as the consequence of the sin. Therefore, if the man could *not* prevent it, he is not culpable nor accountable for the happening of an event beyond his control. If man *could* have prevented the sin, it follows, that, according to Mr. W.'s hypothesis, man had *more power* than God! We ask, Is it possible for a finite being, to have more power than an Infinite Being? For the creature, to have more power than the Creator? If it is possible, Mr. W. is correct in his opinion; but, if it is impossible, then Mr. W.'s sentiments are gross error. Mr. W. has a dilemma, in earnest. He must admit that man has more power than God; or he "cannot reconcile his (God's) character with his ideas of *justice or mercy*." Mr. W. is, most assuredly, in great trouble and difficulty!

Mr. W. also argues, that, because "the Lord swears by himself that it is *his pleasure* the wicked should turn and *live*;" and "as no one will pretend that all sinners do turn from their evil ways in this world, the will of the Lord is either *defeated*, or the death spoken of must be beyond the grave." Now we consider that insanity itself, could not have made a more wild conclusion. Look at the *two* remaining sides of your favourite *triangle*; the death of the *body*, and the death *Paul died*. Is it not evident, that unless the man who remains rebellious to

the last moment of his existence in *this* mode of being, turns to the Lord in another mode of being, that God will be defeated, and his pleasure never be *accomplished*? Mr. W. must admit that God is unchangeable. If it is now, or at any time, his pleasure, that "the sinner should turn and *live*," it will always be his pleasure that the sinner should turn and *live*. If the sinner never turns, and never lives, an event will be perpetuated in which God has no pleasure: God, therefore, must be endlessly defeated and disappointed.

Now, let us again look at the command and its violation. If man had not eaten and died, he could never have received the immortal life and incorruptibility in Christ. If man had not first been *lost*, he could not have been *saved*. Unless man became a sinner, he could not experience the pardoning mercy of God. In fine, unless man had "*surely died*," strayed in sin and error, and learned, by bitter *experience*, the evil of transgressing the commands of God, ignorance of the consequences of transgression would have endangered his future welfare, and stimulated him to wrong-doing. God's character, as the merciful Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of man, would never have been known to man; and man, therefore, could never have worshipped and enjoyed God, nor have been grateful for mercies and favours never known nor received. How true is the declaration of Christ! "To whom *little* is forgiven, the *same loveth little*." And, "as in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ shall *all* be made *alive*." HALLELUJAH!

Mr. W. adds, "We have said thus much to convince Mr. F. that our doctrines do not attribute any *more impotence* to the Divine Being, than the doctrines of every church must, in which the *freedom of the human will* is admitted." So we suppose. But you have here a tacit acknowledgment, that you do attribute *some impotence* to what you must call an OMNIPOTENT Being!!! This may do in your church, but it will not agree with our *Bible*!

Mr. W.'s "*hacknied* quotation" must mean something. Either that "thy people" shall be willing, or shall *not* be willing; or that "thy people" can be willing, or may be willing, or *might* be willing; or, that the speaker did *not care* whether they should be willing or not! Mr. W. can tell which way we shall construe it. However, as this passage is a "*hacknied*" one, and needs the words "*shall be*," to give it an "emphatic and indicative character," take the following—Ps. xxii. 27, 28. "All the ends of the world *shall remember* and *turn* unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations *shall worship* before thee. For the kingdom is the LORD's: and He is the governor among the nations." Ps. lxxxvi. 9, 10. "All nations whom thou hast made *shall come* and worship before thee, O LORD, and shall glorify thy name. For thou art [what? *Not able* to effect any thing without man's "joint labour"? Is this the testimony? No! Thou art] *great*, and doest *wondrous things*; thou *God alone*." Triumphant Truth! GOD ALONE does *wondrous things*! Man can do *nothing*! HALLELUJAH!

(To be continued.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I wish to state the cause of my delay in replying to the letter of Mr. Hyatt, recently published in the Gospel Herald, by request of Rev. Wm. Roy. In consequence of sickness in my family, I have not been at liberty to visit Newark, which is necessary, in order effectually to answer the letter. As soon as circumstances will permit, I shall attend to it, &c.

J. DITCHETT.

☞ The "Society for the investigation and establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet according to adjournment, for Discussion, on Friday Evening next, October 3d, at seven o'clock, at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street. The public is requested to attend.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1823.

NO. 21.

ANOTHER EXCOMMUNICATION.

The following account of the excommunication of Mrs. Horton from the communion of the Presbyterian Church in Southold, (L. I.) will be read with interest. The fact of their having expelled her, without notice being given her of the time, and their refusal to read her letter to the Church, proves them to be afraid to come "to the light, lest their deeds should be reproved."

To the Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Southold, and likewise the Church in general.

Dear Brethren and Sisters, I think I can with propriety use this language, although I am excluded from your society. For the prophet says, "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" I think, if God is the Father of *all*, then all mankind are brethren. It is but a few days since I heard that you had rejected me as a *heretic*. I had previously requested that you would let me know the *day* that I was to be excommunicated, that I might be present; but this was denied me, for I never heard of it until some weeks after it was done. And I do now, upon reflection, feel it to be my duty, to give you a brief summary of the leading sentiments of the stigmatized and persecuted doctrine that I believe and rejoice in.

I believe in the Great First Cause, who is self-existent, and independent; and who is the essence of perfection: who is the Father of our spirits, and the former of our bodies. Who rules with uncontrollable sway in all his wide domains; whose name and nature is *Love*. I believe that God made man, and placed him in the garden of Eden, in a state of innocence; that man sinned and fell from that state of primeval rectitude, into which his Creator placed or formed him; but although this was the case, God, in that early period of time, promised a *Saviour*. I therefore believe, "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all unto justification of life. That as sin has reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." That, as "by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The apostle says, that "Jesus was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification." That "God so loved the world that he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world." That "Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man." That he is the "Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." That the Son of

God was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;" and that he has fulfilled every jot and tittle of the law and answered all its demands. That the great Jehovah has "*sworn by himself*, that unto him every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear, that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength."

All this I sincerely believe with my whole heart; and, furthermore, I believe that not one of the purposes of God will fail of their accomplishment; and the apostle tells us, that God "purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ." And I believe he will do it, for "he is not man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent." He worketh all things after the counsel of his *own will*; and the Scriptures expressly declare, "it is His will that *all should be saved* and come to the knowledge of the truth." I do not believe any more than yourselves, that any one can be saved in *sin* and unbelief; but it is written, "They shall *all* be taught of God;" consequently, they will all come to Christ, and he assures us, that "he that comes to him he will in no wise cast out."

When I was at the church meeting, it was asked me, by one of the brethren, whether I got my doctrine from the *Bible*, or some other book? My answer was, that I saw it in the Bible before I read any other book on the subject. I can tell you, that for two years previous to my publicly declaring that I believed Christ to be the Saviour of the world, there were some things in the Bible that I could not reconcile with the doctrine I had given my assent to; such as these—that God hath no pleasure in the *death* of the sinner; that it is his *will* that *all* should be saved, &c. I believed then, as I do now, that God was unchangeable, and his will unalterable. Therefore, the conclusion that I drew, was, that if it was *God's will*, he certainly would effect it in his own way and time. For me, I felt willing it should be so; but I was willing to say nothing about it; but when the Lord made it clear to my understanding, and I felt the spirit of God witnessing with my spirit, it was then the Lord made me willing to be called a *Universalist*! I can appeal to my God, that he knows with what sincere devotion I poured out my soul to him daily and hourly, beseeching him to lead me into all truth. He knew that *truth* was the object I was in pursuit of. I could not have felt more anxious if my life had been at stake. Therefore I besought our heavenly Father, that he would not suffer me to believe an *error*. That if it was an *error*, I might be convinced of it immediately; and if it was *truth*, I might believe it, and be willing to

bear the reproach consequent upon believing. "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all men*," &c. I was brought into that frame, that I was willing to be counted as the offscouring of the earth for the excellency of the *knowledge of Christ Jesus* my Lord.

At the time when you prohibited me from your communion, my heart was uncommonly penetrated with a sense of the goodness of God in creation, preservation, and redemption. My heart seemed melted down with love and gratitude to the Saviour of the world, that he had not only redeemed a *part*, or the *elect*, but that he redeemed the *whole world* of mankind, and would fit and prepare them for the abodes of blessedness. For "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* [not the *elect*] unto himself." I can sincerely say, that I felt nothing but love to the Church. But, because my love was not *confined to them*, only, I must not be permitted to remain in their society. As soon as my views began to expand, my heart to be enlarged, and universal love, charity and benevolence take possession of my breast, I must no longer remain one of your number. I could not be permitted to come to the table of the Lord, to commemorate the dying love of my dear Redeemer. It seemed hard to me then. I felt as if I had, through the merits of my Saviour, as good a right to the communion table as any of you. I felt as if I had not done any thing worthy of suspension. I therefore felt, as if the church, or those that were concerned in it, had done very wrong, and the church would not prosper. And now, you have entirely rejected me. What is it for? I answer: It is for believing the *oath of Jehovah*, when he says, "I have sworn by myself," &c. It is for believing the testimony of *all God's holy prophets*: "the *restitution of all things*;"—and which must I believe? the testimony of *all God's holy prophets*; or *man*, who testifies the reverse? God says, "he will make an *end of sin* and destroy the Devil and his works." And when the Devil and his works are destroyed, and an end made of sin, I cannot conceive as there can any thing remain to torment the offspring of God. It is certain that sin and misery are cause and consequence. When the cause is terminated, I think the consequence will no longer remain in existence. God says, "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wrath, for the spirit should fail before me and the souls I have made." It would be blasphemy in the extreme, for me to say, in contradiction to God, that he *will contend for ever*. That he will punish his offending children through the wasteless ages of eternity, when he has said by the spirit of inspiration, that he "doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men;" but if need be for their profit. I would wish to know, what profit could result from the affliction to any one, if he were to endure it endlessly? I think this would be a contradiction in terms.

However, I believe the time is coming, when inconsistency shall cease. When animosity shall be done away. When "all the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the Lord, and all the kindreds

of the nations shall worship before him." When charity, that heavenly grace, the grace that is so little cultivated and so greatly needed, shall take possession of every heart; when every rebellious heart will be brought into sweet subjection to the Father of Spirits and live. In the full and firm belief of these soul-satisfying truths, and likewise in the belief that, although you have severed the ties that bound us here on earth, we shall all meet in that world above, where there can be no separation; where every faculty of our souls shall unite to celebrate the praises of the world's Saviour,

I subscribe myself your persecuted sister.

BETHIAH HORTON.

N. B. It is my request that this be read before the Church.

Note—Mrs. Horton's request has not been complied with. The Church, and congregation also, will now have an opportunity to read the letter at their leisure. ED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—Being a subscriber to your valuable paper, and seeing by your Prospectus, that its columns are free to all, I have thought fit to send you the following. If it meets with your approbation, you will please to insert it.

"*Make thyself many as the cankerworm, make thyself many as the locust.*" This was the declaration of the prophet Nahum, concerning the city of Nineveh. And although it was spoken more than two thousand years ago, yet the similarity which obtains between this, and the preaching of modern Doctors, must be observed by every reflecting mind. At this era, multitudes are engaged in the missionary field. Every expedient is resorted to, in order to enlarge its borders. Popes are now calling upon priests and prelates; saying, "Make thyself *many* as the cankerworm, make thyself *many* as the locust." At such a crisis, it becomes the friends of truth, whose reason is not obscured by fanaticism, to stand forth, and boldly defend the truth. Let us inquire, "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" Is he not the Omnipotent Jehovah still? Can he not perform his own work? It would seem by the language of the present day, that he has taken a journey into the country, so remote from this "enlightened land," that there is little, or no probability of his return; and, appearances denote, that his presence can be dispensed with, without detriment to the missionary cause. His aid is little needed, when men have substituted the power of *money*, instead of the power of God. A man's goodness is now measured by his liberality to this crusading cause. And woe be to that man, who, seeing the impious fraud, dares to expose them. "But thanks be to God, this *wo* exists only in *words*." Ecclesiastics are now circumscribed in their limits. They can no longer roast their victims at the stake; and kindle a flame, to light them on their way, to an imaginary place of torment. "But the pointing of the finger of scorn, the delivering of anathemas from the desk, and the thunder of excommunication must be their resort."

That the foregoing considerations are not exaggerated, I appeal to the many sermons, which have been preached within a few years. Many of them have been published, and circulated with the greatest assiduity. When we take one of them in our hand to peruse, we are disappointed. There we might expect to find the *love of God* portrayed, and the malevolence of the devil, acting in opposition to the merciful designs of Deity. Instead of this, we are told of the *vengeance* of an angry God; who will pour out his wrath upon his dependent offspring, world without end; unless we give the hard earned penny to save them from the devouring flames! How diminutive appears such language as this, contrasted with the declaration of our Saviour, to his disciples, "Provide neither *gold*, nor *silver*, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat!" Well might one address these pretenders to sanctity, as Christ did those in his time. "Wo unto you scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites, ye encompass sea and land to gain one proselyte, and, when ye have gained him, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves."

In the words which we have selected for our motto, two kinds of animals are mentioned, very different in appearance; yet agreeing in this particular, that they both come under the character of *destroyers*. We know but very little of them in this country; but if we can credit history, and the relations of travellers, in many of the eastern countries, particularly in Syria, the progress of the *locust* is marked with desolation, and pinching famine is often the consequence of their inroads. And the *cankerworm* is no less destructive in his sphere. Although it has not the use of wings, to assist its movements from one place to another; yet, steady to its purpose, it devours the leaves of the shrub, or tree, upon which it is placed; till all the herbage is destroyed, and the tree either withers, or dies. Then it evacuates its post, for some more flourishing bough, where it begins its depredations anew. This is not very dissimilar to the practice of many of the professed preachers of the gospel. With an eye to their own popularity, they tell the people, to be *liberal* to the missionaries; threatening them with the wrath of the Almighty, if they refuse. By their unremitting endeavours to support this cause, upon which their prosperity depends, they sponge the last shilling from their credulous hearers; and thus impoverish their society to that degree, that, like the tree upon which the cankerworm feasted, it droops and dies. Then, the "Poor, pious minister," to disengage himself from the miseries in which he has involved his parish, has recourse to an expedient much practised at the present day, viz, *A loud call*. Thus, like the worm, when he had destroyed the herbage upon one tree, sought sustenance upon another. Locusts are insects of flight; confined to no spot, they "range the air, or take their pastime in the spacious field," and destroy whatever comes in their way. Their march is more terrible to eastern nations, than the ravages of war.

The husbandman sows his seed, and anxiously hopes for a plentiful harvest. But, his expectations are all blasted in one short hour. When he beholds his fields covered with the desolating tribe, he stands aghast; and the prospect of an approaching famine stares him in the face.

By the locust, we are shown the character of those, who are sometimes denominated "*Holy beggars*;" who, under the direction of some society, are instructed, and sent through the world; and, like the "Horse leach, crying, Give! Give!" they collect clothes, or any thing that will be of use in the crusading expedition. In this way, many "pious youths" have been educated, and much money obtained and sent to India, to build palaces, or pamper hireling priests. The hardships to which the missionaries are exposed, is pleaded as an excuse for their prodigality. And could they not appear in splendor among the brethren, it is doubtful, whether any proselytes would be gained. They would fain make us credulous enough to believe, that had they the *purses* of the community at their disposal, Paganism would soon be at an end; and the term "Heathen would be lost in that of Christian."

We have now seen the two characters exhibited to view; and if the march of our native *cankerworms* and *locusts*, have not been marked by such complete destruction, as upon the plains of Damascus, they have not been characterized by a less greedy spirit. Nay, the balance preponderates in favour of the former. The locust and cankerworm were never known to take more than sufficient to satisfy the calls of *nature*. Not so with our natives. Although they may accumulate wealth, and heap up gold as the mire of the street, yet the cry is reiterated, "*Give! Give!*" But the time has come, when this sound begins to be unheeded. Men now see the fallacy of schemes, so visionary as those of modern missionaries. A voice is heard in the land, publishing *glad tidings* to man. And the day is fast approaching, in which the cankerworm and locust will be seen as they are; when they will be the derision of all, who wish well to the interests of society; and will be remembered only to be execrated.

Then shall the gospel be preached in its apostolic purity. Then shall the reign of the beast come to an end; and every tongue shall be employed, in "ascribing glory, honour, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever."

B. H.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

(Continued from page 158.)

"But this leads us to a point where Mr. Fitz appears to be as ignorant of our doctrines, as we can possibly be of his. In the course of all our future discussions, then, let it be remembered, that *we do not believe in any arbitrary punishment beyond the grave*. Every soul enters into the state of *his own choice*—every one *voluntarily* conjoins himself to a society whose desires and thoughts are in exact agreement with his own. These desires and thoughts are his own property, acquired and cherished by the "deeds done in the body." Some de-

light to soar, like the majestic eagle, in the blaze of celestial light; while others have so degraded their nature, by the love and practice of evil, that they choose to brood in solitude and darkness, like the unseemly owl. "For every one that doeth evil, hateth the light." John iii. 20. Some aspire to such enjoyments as arise from the innocence of the lamb, and the affection of the dove; while others find the centre of their delights in the carion banquet of the vulture, or the filth and mire of sensuality. Each one formed his own heaven or hell *within him*, previous to the dissolution of the body; after that, Omnipotence itself cannot change the owl into an eagle, the vulture into a dove, or the swine into a lamb. While the soul was united to the natural mind and body, this change (with man's co-operation) might have been effected; but in putting off materiality, we part with all the *mediums* through which regeneration can alone be effected. Our probationary state then ceases. *He that is filthy, must be filthy still.*

"From these observations it will be seen that we do not believe in *arbitrary* punishments after death. The idea of a *local* heaven, or a *local* hell, (and, more especially, of a *local lake of material fire and brimstone*;) we hold to be low, earthly, gross, and ridiculous. Spirit can no more be located than thought or desire can. Heaven and hell are *states*, not *places*—neither up, nor down, nor far off, but "*within you*." Were we, at this moment to drop our material bodies, we should find ourselves (without moving through an inch of space) surrounded by such *spiritual* scenery as exactly corresponded to our spiritual taste—the ruling love or passion of our souls. Paradisaical, if we love God and his kingdom above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves; but wild, dreary, and filthy, if we have placed our chief affections on self, the world, and the flesh. Each one would find himself in his own element; and yet no one so low but that he would be continually under the government of that Divine mercy, which is eternally exerting itself to render the state of each one less productive of misery than it otherwise would be. "If I descend into hell, behold thou art there." Each one enters into the joy of his lord, (his ruling affection,) whether it be God or mammon. He who feels unhappy in the society of the Godly *here*, would be still more unhappy in such society *there*. Consequently the existence of that *state* (not *place*) which the Scriptures call *hell*, is an eternal evidence of the mercy of God; for thousands would be infinitely more unhappy without it.

"But it may be asked, "Where then is the inducement to seek for heaven, and to avoid the opposite state?" This question we answer by asking another. Were the choice set before us, would it not be a mark of true wisdom to prefer the enjoyments of the eagle, the lamb, and the dove, to those of the owl, the swine, and the vulture? To seek light rather than darkness? Order than disorder? The delicate refinements of social life, than the savage recreations of uncivilized barbarity? Such a choice is set before us as soon as we are old enough to dis-

tinguish right from wrong, or good from evil; before we have suffered our minds to become a "habitation for dragons, and a court for owls." The word of God was given to enable us to choose aright, and time sufficient is granted to avert the consequences of a rash or foolish choice, and the privilege is allowed of choosing again and again, until death closes the scene of probation; then, "he that is filthy, let him be filthy still."

"All this evinces the mercy of that God, who "created man in his own image," by endowing him with *freedom of will*. But after our souls have separated from the body, it would be no act of mercy to fold the swine with the sheep, for his darling filth would not be there. "The sow that was washed" would wish to return "to her wallowing in the mire." The dove-cote would yield no joys to the vulture, if restrained from devouring its inmates; and the spiritual owl's worst hell would be to encounter the blaze of that Sun, whose heat is love, and whose light is wisdom.

"Such are our ideas of a future state of existence; and they arise from the positive conviction we feel, that every man is endowed with perfect *freedom of will* in spiritual things. We perfectly agree with Mr. Fitz, that "it is impossible for a thing (or principle) to be, and not to be, at the same time." Therefore, we say, if a man has *free will*, (and that he has, both Scripture and reason sufficiently attest,) it is impossible for God to make him good and happy in opposition to his inclinations. If man says, "Evil, be thou my good," God cannot prevent him, without first depriving him of all that constitutes him a human being. And for this plain reason:

"A man's ruling love is the life of his soul. Destroy this, and you destroy the man, as to his spiritual identity. In order to render him happy, the love of evil must be gradually removed, and the love of good will gradually flow into its place. But it is a solecism to say that this can be done without man's consent. Were an act of Omnipotence exerted to this end, without being met by the consent and co-operation of man, it would produce a different result; it would annihilate an impure soul, and create a pure one in the same body, which was not the object intended. It would be a *new creation*, instead of *regeneration*."

(To be continued.)

REPLY.

We acknowledge ourselves indebted to Mr. W. for information of his doctrine. But, we are sorry to be obliged to say, that Mr. W.'s doctrine has no better foundation than *supposition*. We do not approve of taking things for granted. This *petitio principii* does not please us. We look for *proof*. It appears, however, that Mr. W. does not believe the Deity will *make* any man miserable in a future state. The Deity will only *let* a man make himself miserable. Mr. W. is true to his text; and will have it, that *Omnipotence is impotent!* This we do not understand. It appears that *Omnipotence* "cannot change an owl into an eagle;" but when *mighty man co-operates*, Omnipotence can make doves of vultures, and lambs of swine! As

our subject relates to *men*, and not to swine, vultures, &c. we shall leave these as the peculiar property of Mr. W.'s system. The important question is this—Cannot Omnipotence change man from the earthly image to the heavenly image, and from corruption and mortality, to incorruption and immortality, without *man's co-operation*, or "*joint labour*?" This interrogation is important, and must be attended to. Will Mr. W. produce some authority, besides his own opinion, and the opinion of Mr. Swedenborg, to prove that *materiality*, &c. are the only *mediums* through which *regeneration* can be effected? Also, prove that the present is a *probationary* state, and the only one? Also, that the declaration of the Spirit to John, in the Apocalypse, "*He that is filthy, let him be filthy still*," (not, *must* be, &c.) has an exclusive reference to a posterior mode of being?

Mr. W. in his *first* paragraph* says, of an Omnipotent act, without man's consent and *co-operation*, (assistance,)—"it would annihilate an impure soul, and create a pure one in the same body, which was not the object intended. It would be a *new creation*, instead of *regeneration*." We shall let Mr. W. dispose of the word *annihilate* as he pleases, but we shall contend, and prove too, that man is actually *regenerated* without his *co-operation*; and that *regeneration* is a *new creation*, just as much as the first making or beginning of man, was a *creation*. This done, and Mr. W.'s suppositions, (for they deserve no better name,) will be properly appreciated. The word *regeneration* occurs but twice in the Scriptures, namely, Matt. xix. 28. Titus iii. 5. The word rendered regeneration is *καταγενεσια*. Definition. Secundus ortus, instauratio, reditus ad vitum, regeneratio. Or *second beginning*, *revival*, or *restoration*, a *return*, or *coming again to life*, *being produced again*. Vide Schrev. Lex. An apostle predicated every thing upon the fact of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Paul declared, "*Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God*." Man, in the aggregate, therefore, was regenerated in Christ, their Head, and rose triumphant over sin, death, and hell, from the grave. When a man arrives at the knowledge and belief of this fact, he is "*born from above*." He is "*delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son*." Christ came to "*destroy death, and him that had the power of death, which is the devil, and to deliver*," &c. If Mr. W. will annihilate the *impurity*, the soul will be left *pure*. Is not this the object intended? We see that human nature was regenerated in Christ. The time is coming, when all men shall be regenerated, or rather participate in the regeneration which Christ effected. For their corruption shall be changed for incorruption, and their mortality for immortality. Not "*owls be changed into eagles*!" This is farther proved and illustrated, by referring to Acts iii. 21, where we read, of the "*restitution of all things*," &c. The word rendered restitution, means all this;

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning the eleventh, which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first, &c.

namely—A *rebuilding*, or *making good* into the *original form*. For God made man *good*. Mr. W.'s notions, therefore, are gross error.

Dr. Clarke informs us, that the Pythagoreans used the same word, which is rendered *regeneration*, &c. to express, according to their doctrine of the transmigration or metempsychosis, the entering of the soul into a *new body*, and into a *new state of being*. Dr. C. however, [Matt. xix. 28.] alters the punctuation, and reads as follows—"Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones," &c. [Que. Did not Judas follow Christ?] Dr. C. considers it to be utterly improper to make the time of the regeneration to be before the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. We agree with him in this particular. For Christ took the *one* blood of which all nations were made; and when he rose, we rose in the person of our Head, incorruptible and immortal. All mankind, without exception, will as certainly triumph over sin, death, hell, and the grave, as Christ triumphed. HALLELUJAH!

Mr. W. in his *second* paragraph, considers man in a future state, however low, to "*be continually under the government of Divine Mercy, which is eternally exerting itself to render the state of each one less productive of misery than it would otherwise be*!" Of what avail can all this be? You have decided, that no *arbitrary* punishment will be inflicted. That when the probationary state ends, Omnipotence can do nothing. "*He that is filthy, must be filthy still*!" The "*mediums*" will exist no longer! And, wonderful to relate, this *hell*, which Divine Mercy is continually exerting itself to render less productive of *misery*, is so necessary to the enjoyment of its inmates, that "*thousands would be infinitely more unhappy without it*!" Then, we say, they must be *infinitely* happy with it. Now it appears to us, if words have any meaning, that friend W.'s *hell* is quite as *comfortable* a place as his *heaven*! It will not suit logic in any shape, to trifle with *infinities*. Remember this. Also please to recollect, that all men shall be raised immortal, &c.

Mr. W. commences his *third* paragraph very properly. "*But it may be asked, 'Where then is the inducement to seek for heaven, and to avoid the opposite state?'*" Surely, if hell is a place which makes its inmates *infinitely happier* than they could be without it, it is a very desirable place! We question whether there can be any heaven which can do more than this. But Mr. W. answers the question, by asking, "*Would it not be a mark of true wisdom to prefer the enjoyments of the eagle, the lamb, and the dove, to those of the owl, the swine, and the vulture?—to seek light rather than darkness; order than disorder?*" &c. Answer: No! Provided your premises are correct. If to be an owl, to be in the dark, and to be in disorder, will produce infinite happiness, we say, Let us be owls, give us darkness, give us disorder! The reverse of these, call them by what names you please,

must produce infinite misery; or your premises are false. Mr. W. again "closes the probationary scene," and says, "Let him that is filthy be filthy still." So we say, by all means. If filth will produce infinite happiness, we ought to avoid all that is clean, as we would avoid infinite misery.

Mr. W. says, in his *fourth* paragraph, "it would be no act of mercy to fold the swine with the sheep, for his darling filth would not be there," &c. True, very true. The "darling filth" produces infinite happiness! The swine cannot do without it.

Mr. W., in his *fifth* paragraph, says, "Such are our ideas of a future state of existence, and they arise from the positive conviction we feel, that every man is endowed with perfect freedom of will in spiritual things." This is a candid confession. We were persuaded that friend Woodworth obtained his strange ideas of a future state of existence from an illegitimate source, and now we have his own word for it. It appears his ideas are from his own head, and not one of them from Scripture or reason. This accounts for their singularity and incongruity. Mr. W. is deserving of praise for his candour. But is not a *freedom of will* very imperfect, if it leads the possessor to make a wrong choice? We, however, are free to acknowledge, that Mr. W.'s perfect freedom leads men to choose a hell of infinite happiness. If this could be proved, it would be perfect indeed. Again. By "*perfect freedom*," we should be inclined to understand *perfect ability*. For freedom to choose, without *ability* to direct in the choosing, would be worth nothing. You might, with as much propriety, tell a blind man, that he has perfect freedom to choose an article he cannot see, as to tell a man who prefers being a *hog* to a *lamb*, to choose for himself. And still, according to Mr. W.'s views, he cannot fail of making a good choice. When Paul speaks, (Ephes. i.) of "being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world," are we to understand that Paul chose himself? That Paul co-operated with God, &c. Was it Paul's will to be converted to christianity, when he was going to Damascus? Or, did God, contrary to Paul's will, and without his co-operation, enlighten his understanding? Are those who are *blind*, in *prison*, *bound*, &c. perfect in freedom? Did God deprive Paul of "all that constituted him a human being?"

We now pass over Mr. W.'s *sixth* paragraph, having already considered it, in our remarks on regeneration. (Concluded in our next.)

From the Rev. Mr. Cudstorf, pastor of Helmstead, to the Rev. Mr. Kerker, pastor of Lawstorp.

I must regret with you, my dear friend, the mischievous progress of Philosophy. Governors and Princes begin to think, and we are lost. England has done most to corrupt Europe with her unfortunate discoveries in relation to light, gravitation, and the aberration of the fixed stars. Men will soon become so rash as to believe nothing but what is *reasonable*, and they will argue against our clerical inventions.

Quodcumque ostendis mihi sic incredulus odi.

I have reflected in the bitterness of my soul, on the unfortunate dislike, which so many persons of all ranks, of all ages, and of all sexes, so openly display against us. Perhaps our own divisions are the source of all; perhaps, also, we should attribute somewhat to the want of circumspection of certain persons who are much more successful in disgusting, than in gaining over others. We have insulted the philosophers, as the Lutherans have outraged the Calvinists, as the Calvinists have slandered the Episcopalians, the Episcopalians the Puritans, the Puritans the Quakers, and as all have the Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholics all others.

If we had been more moderate, I am persuaded they would not have been so disgusted with us. Let us pardon, my fellow labourer, those who unjustly attack the foundations of an edifice which we are demolishing ourselves, and breaking the heads of each other with the stones of it.

The only means left us, I think, to pacify our enemies, was to have displayed towards them, modesty and charity; but we commenced with a prodigality of abusive epithets, not surpassed by a discussion at Billingsgate. We have heaped upon them the names of fools, libertines, debauchees, infidels, devils, Atheists, and backsliders; we have forced them in their own defence to take up arms. Would it not be more wise, to employ soft and gentle means, after the manner of our Master, than to beat up for a crusade with the violence of Peter the Hermit?

At one time we tell them our opinions are so clear, that any one must be mad to deny them; and at other times, we have declared them so obscure, that it is necessary to prostrate our reason, and believe without inquiry. Is it possible they should not revolt at these absurdities?

Each sect of Christians pretend to universality, but our adversaries deride us, when they take a map of the world, and place their thumb on the little corner we inhabit. If we were wise, we would convince our adversaries, that the tenets we embrace, deserve to be universal. Do not disgust them by declaring that there is no honesty, no morality, but among ourselves. What well raised and wise man will believe, that Confucius, Pythagoras, Zeleucus, Socrates, Plato, Cato, Scipio, Cicero, Trajan, and the Antonines, had no pretensions to virtue? This affords them too much ground for accusing us of calumniating the virtuous and the wise of all antiquity. Can the Anabaptist, with his hands bloody from the slaughter at Munster, boast that no man is virtuous but himself? Can the Calvinist, just risen from the assassination of the Duke of Guise, say so? Can the Papist, glutted with the feast of St. Bartholomew? Paltrot, Clement, Chatel, Ravallac, were very pious men; but really, I suspect that you would rather take your chance with La-Motte, Lass-Vager, Gapendi, Locke, Collins, Bayle, Descartes, and Middleton! No, my good friend, let us avoid arguments so easily turned against us.

Father Craye, said, "Let us have no reasoning;" and I say, let us have no controversy at all. It was formerly said, we permitted ourselves to be carried

away by ambition, hatred, avarice, and revenge; that we warred against the civil authorities, and shed innocent blood. Let us do so no more. Let us frankly acknowledge that the church belongs to the state, and not the state to the church; and let us obey our civil governors, as other citizens are bound to do. It is our scandalous conduct, rather than our unintelligible doctrine, that has revolted the public; and if they rise up against us, whose fault is it? Philosophers do not believe in any of our tenets; no wonder, for we do not believe them ourselves. But will they believe them the more for the outrageous manner we employ against them? Shall we crusade against all the Asiatic and African nations who are infidels? Shall we treat as enemies of God and man, all who doubt our disputing doctrines? Shall we bow down with fear before an infidel sovereign who despises us, and persecute every poor wretch who does not worship us? We cannot succeed in reversing the human intellect. Let government and the philosophers alone, that they may let us alone. They may be provoked to conquer us; we can never conquer them. At any rate, let us cease from insolence and anger, which become us so little, and do us so much harm. You know the Rev. Mr. Dursol, a good man, but somewhat choleric. He was explaining one day, the story of Baalam's Ass, to a young lad, who laughed at it. Mr. Dursol was very angry, he exclaimed, he threatened, he proved clearly, that an Ass might very well expostulate, when he saw before him an angel with a drawn sword. The lad still laughed. Mr. Dursol grew very angry and gave the boy a severe kick, who acknowledged, in tears, that Baalam's Ass spake, but then *he did not kick*. This made a great impression on me, and I have ever since advised my friends against kicking and braying.

J. CUDSTORF.

The above letter should have been addressed to Howley, Bishop of London, who in a late sermon, (1822) declares, that for the purpose of receiving religious benefit, we must approach the church with all that "*prostration of the understanding and the will*," which the occasion requires; that in this, our day, there is great need of an effectual counterpoise to the increasing influx of sense and knowledge; and that all knowledge is worse than useless, if it be not connected with specific forms of religious discipline.

Col. Telescope.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I attended meeting on Sunday (Sept. 21.) at the Presbyterian meeting-house in Morristown, (N. J.) and heard the Rev. Mr. Brownley of Baskingridge. In the morning his text was, 1 Tim. iii. 16. "And without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness." He had much to say of *mysteries*; and it was evident to my understanding, that the *mystery* Paul spoke of, as made known unto the saints, was altogether a *secret* to this Rev. Gentleman. He spoke of Judas, as *accursed*, and called him the *cursed*, which did not argue in favour of God's love being shed abroad in his heart. For, we are commanded to *bless*, and to *curse* not.

This Rev. Gentleman, to my astonishment, made the following declaration—"If I were to disbelieve the doctrine of *future and eternal punishment*, I would commit *murder, theft*," &c. naming a long and black catalogue of crimes. He added, "If I believed in Universalism, I would preach no more." To this I assent. I believe this gentleman would not preach any more *error*, if he knew and believed the *truth*. Now, Mr. Editor, this Rev. Gentleman must be a very *wicked* man, on his own confession; for we have his word, that *fear of punishment*, (and not *love of God or virtue*,) is all that keeps him from the *State Prison and the gallows*! I, for one, most ardently hope, if the Rev. Gentleman has told the truth of himself, that he will continue to *fear the devil*, or society will be in great danger of his depredations! I feel it to be my duty to say, of *myself*, that *love to God and man*, and not *fear* of the *devil*, or future and eternal punishment, prevents me from sinning.

The Rev. Gentleman quoted, as final, Matt. xxv. 46: Stating, "that if the *miseries* of the wicked have an end, the *happiness* of the righteous will also have an end," &c. Your remarks on this passage, will oblige

A WATCHMAN.

Morristown, Sept. 28, 1823.

REMARKS

ON MATTHEW XXV. 46.

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

The common conclusion, that, "If the *miseries* of the wicked have an end, the *happiness* of the righteous must end also," supposes the happiness of the righteous to depend on the misery of the wicked; or that there is no evidence found in the Scriptures to prove the future and endless happiness of the righteous, except the verse above quoted. The first supposition is too abominable and absurd to need refutation. The last, therefore, if true, is attended with serious consequences; for we shall prove that the time spoken of is limited. Consequently, if no other evidence can be adduced to prove a future happy existence, posterior to the present, there is no evidence whatever to believe such an hypothesis. This is our ground, and no man can drive us from it! Should any one enter the lists against us, they are informed, that we do not allow our opponents to *take things for granted*; but shall insist on proof for every thing disputed. We do not approve of such logic as the celebrated Methodist, Dr. Adam Clarke used, where he says, in his commentary on Matt. xxv. 41. "*Prepared for the devil and his angels*," that "the devil and his angels sinned *before the creation of the world*, and the place of torment was *then* prepared for them." How did Dr. C. know this? Was he present at the time? Pray, how could the devil and his angels sin, *before* there was any devil or devil's angels to sin? Dr. C. adds—"It never was *designed* for *human* souls." It appears then, that the Creator was *disappointed*. In the first place, *Heaven* itself, brilliant with Divine Glory, and illumined by the beatific presence of Jehovah, was a defective place. It was, to use a just simile, spiritually, as a filthy city is physically, a place where corruption generates foul plagues. The inhabitants of heaven became diseased, and a *lazaretto*, called *hell*, was prepared for their reception! Eventually, the disease, like the Yellow Fever, was exported to the paradise of human perfection, on this earth, and

communicated to millions of human beings, who are sent to the infernal hospital which was never "designed" for them, but originally prepared for the "devil and his angels!" Reader, we are seriously plain upon a subject which, if serious at all, is serious in *absurdity*. This hypothesis appears to us, to be outrageously subversive of Scripture and reason.

The following is from Dr. Clarke's commentary on the passage under consideration; and we are compelled, from a sense of duty, to accuse this learned man of *dishonesty*.* Dr. Clarke says, "But some are of opinion that this punishment shall have an *end*; this is as likely as that the glory of the righteous shall have an *end*: for the same word is used to express the *duration* of the punishment, *καταστροφῆς αἰώνιον*, as is used to express the *duration* of the state of glory: *δόξης αἰώνιον*. I have seen the best things that have been written in favour of the final redemption of damned spirits; but I never saw an answer to the argument against that doctrine, drawn from this verse, but what sound learning and criticism should be ashamed to acknowledge. The original word *αἰών* is certainly to be taken here in its proper grammatical sense, *continued being*, *αἰὼν αἰών* NEVER ENDING. Some have gone a *middle way*, and think that the wicked shall be *annihilated*. This, I think, is contrary to the text; if they go into punishment, they continue to exist; for that which ceases to be, ceases to suffer."

Reader, it may astonish you to learn, that Dr. C., in his notice of some other passages, has admitted the contrary of what he here asserts. And farther, Christ came in the glory of his Father, and actually rewarded every man according to his works, in *this mode of being*! (See GOS. HER. No. 17. p. 134. C.'s Com. on Matt. xvi. 27, 28.)

Dr. C., therefore, has contradicted himself, and is *unworthy of credit*! We go farther. Take the Doctor's assertion for truth, and you will find the Bible to be unintelligible. If the word *aionion* necessarily means *never ending*, then Paul speaks of *never ending* ages having an *end*! We are willing to meet these Herculean giants in orthodoxy, and weigh them in their own balance. Now Dr. C., on Matt. xiii. 39, says, of "*καταστροφῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος*, translated *the end of the world*," relative to their being rendered "*the end of the age*," &c. "That the words have *this meaning* in other places, *there can be no doubt*; and *this may be* their primary meaning here!" Will Dr. C. or any other person pretend, that *aionos* has a different root from *aionion*? When we find Dr. C. contradicting himself, and struggling, like a bear in a net, to disengage himself from absurdity, we must *pity him*.

Now for Matt. xxv. 46. Why did not Dr. C. give the meaning of the word *kolasin*, rendered *punishment*? We answer, Because he *knew* that it was a *wholesome discipline*, intended to make the party *better*! He knew he could not define the word without introducing the familiar figure of *pruning trees*, to make them *bear good fruit*! Therefore, we say the Doctor was dishonest to pass over the most prominent word in the passage; and to twist the residue to suit a present purpose, at the expense of contradicting his previous assertions! The state of the case is this. Dr. C. has admitted that Christ came, (in the past tense,) as declared in Matt. xvi. 27, 28. (And all must admit this, or plumply deny the testimony.) Now we say, that Matt. xvi. 27, 28, (and other parallel passages,) speaks of the *time* of Christ's coming; and Matt. xxv. 31—46; of *what should take place* when he should come. Consequently, you must admit, that the coming spoken of in Matt. xxv. 31—46, is the same with that of

Matt. xvi. 27, 28, or you must prove that Christ actually came, as declared in Matt. xvi. 27, 28, *before* he made the declaration of what should happen at his coming, in Matt. xxv. 31—46, or it follows, that the first relates to the *time*, and the latter to the *manner* of his coming. We consider this to be unavoidable. There is no escape. This conclusion is perfectly *irresistible*.

Again. Please to consider, that it is the kingdom or reign of Christ, which *commences* at the time of Christ's coming. This kingdom will *end*. We prove this, positively, by 1 Cor. xv. 24. It will no longer be a *Mediatorial Kingdom*. The capital error lies here. Mankind make the coming of Christ, and the commencement of his kingdom, to be at the very period when it ends. See Rev. xiv. 6, 7, where the preaching of the gospel, and the judgment of God, are simultaneous. They commenced together; about 1800 years ago. The Jews are on the left hand, in darkness. [See Isa. vi. 9—12. Rom. xi. 25—36.] There the Jewish nation, which was separated, will remain, until the *fulness*, all the Gentiles shall come in. The Jews, in the Gospel dispensation, are treated as though they were enemies; when, in fact, they are declared to be *loved* for the fathers' sakes! We think proper to caution those sticklers for an unmerciful construction of these passages, to beware how they abuse Universalists. For the abusing of Universalists, will not be a compliance with the requisitions, as they are considered, of Matt. xxv. 35, 36.

According to Dr. C.'s doctrine, a man can believe to-day, backslide to-morrow, and go to his endless hell on the third day. Now Christ declares, "He that believeth on the Son, *hath* [possesses] *everlasting life*." The very word rendered everlasting and eternal in Matt. xxv. 46. When a man loses his faith, his *eternal life ends*! Also, when unbelief ceases, the everlasting punishment *ends*. Nearly 1800 years ago, Christ said, "*Now is the judgment of this world*." (Age.) Unbelievers say, No! The judgment will not commence until this world, this mode of being, shall end. Who shall we believe? Christ; or those who give him the lie direct? We recommend to the reader, to examine, with the greatest attention and care, 1 Cor. xv. He will there find, that the salvation and future happiness of man, is predicated, alone, on the fact, that Christ is risen from the dead. The word *aionion*, rendered everlasting and eternal, has nothing to do with man's *future* state, in any manner or shape whatever. It is puerile for clergymen to be continually harping about this word, and this passage. It betrays either gross *ignorance*, or *knavery*. No man, who is acquainted with the Greek language, and is also well read in the Scriptures, and has only a bird's-eye view of God's purposes, would dare hazard his reputation for common sense, and common honesty, by making these foolish objections on the meaning of a word, which has no relation to man's future state.

We regret that Dr. Clarke is not present to answer for himself. We believe that the *shame* he speaks of, would, in that case, be altogether his own. We want no better evidence to shut his mouth, and confound him, than his own premises and their conclusions! For, as to "damned spirits," we deny that there are any, except the spirits in human bodies of clay, in this mode of being, and they are, says Christ, "condemned [or damned, if you like it better] *already*." John iii. 18. Not, will be damned in another world. "And this is the condemnation, [damnation], that light is come into the world, and men *loved darkness rather than light*, because their deeds were evil." Not endless misery in another world! Reader, "Take heed, that no man *deceive you*."

* If this sounds harsh, reader, say, want of candour.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1823.

NO. 22.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

(Concluded from page 164.)

"But in saying all this, we do not attribute to the Deity either *impotence, ignorance, or indifference*, (which are the three words that gave rise to this controversy) not a wit more than when we say 'Omnipotence itself *cannot* form a *square circle*, or create two contiguous hills without a valley between them.' It is agreed, on all hands, that whatever implies an *imperfection* or a *contradiction*, is not within the circle of divine order, nor applicable to the omnipotence of God. But how can we conceive of a greater contradiction, or a more palpable absurdity, than the following position:—*God can compel a free agent to think, feel, act, and enjoy, in direct opposition to his own choice, wishes, thoughts, and desires?*

"Having, imperceptibly, entered thus largely into this subject, want of room will prevent us, at this time, from descending into particulars, as respects a formal reply to the remarks and queries of Mr. Fitz. Indeed, on reviewing the subject, we do not now see the necessity of particularizing. Our general answer above, includes all that we could say; because Mr. F. will now perceive that we occupy very different ground from what he had been led to suppose. So far from admitting "that God's mercy is *finite*," we say it is *infinite*, and extends even to the hells. We know that "a sufficient reason *can* be given for the permission of the present state of affairs," but Mr. F. has not assigned the right one; and we suspected that he could not, without impugning his own doctrines. We have attempted to prove that man *cannot* be saved, or made holy and happy against his will. With the great I AM, the past, present, and future, form *one eternal NOW*, on which foreknowledge cannot be predicated. He created man, and peopled all the worlds of the universe, for the purpose of imparting, to other beings, from the inexhaustible fund of his own infinite felicity. The end of creation was the eternal happiness of the creature; and every thing in the universe was intended solely for the promotion of that end. Hence man was endowed with *freedom of will*, in order that he might be capable of conjoining himself to his Creator by regeneration, and thereby become receptive of heavenly felicity. Being a free agent, man had the power of turning to God, or turning from him. He exercised this power, turned from the only fountain of spiritual life, was no longer receptive of felicity, and was consequently miserable. This state continued until man had nearly lost the freedom of his will, and the power of returning to God. From this dreadful condition, however, God redeemed him, by coming in the

flesh, and conquering the hells which, with man's consent, had shackled his mind, and held his will in bondage. Since that every man has full power to turn to God and live. Some exercise this power—others do not—all are *free* to act as they please. We have shown that hell is not a *place*, but a *state* adapted to the disposition of its subjects; God did not *design* any man for this *state*, and, consequently, cannot be charged with cruelty. He made him *free*, to stand or fall, and cannot therefore, be either *ignorant or impotent*.

"Mr. Fitz says that our third question was answered in his reply to the two first. But we have looked in vain for such an answer. Surely, he does not mean to be understood, that God permits innocent lambs and doves to suffer pain, "for a short time, for *man's* good!" Does God permit his innocent creatures to suffer for the guilty ones? How is this? We ask for information."

REPLY.

Mr. W. in his *first* paragraph* considers, that he does not attribute *impotence, &c.* to the Deity, in his doctrine, "not a whit more than when we say, 'Omnipotence itself *cannot* form a *square circle*, or create two contiguous hills without a valley between them.'" We deny this. For *nothing* is impossible with God. Now there is *no such thing* as a *square circle*; because the being *round* makes the circle; nor two hills, &c. without a valley, &c. because the *valley* forms and constitutes the hills. But there is such a thing as God's making man good and happy without man's *co-operation*. And this is quite as reasonable as to suppose that God could make man at the beginning without man's "*joint labour*." Mr. W.'s conclusion, therefore, is a false one. And it implies an *imperfection*, to say that God cannot do that *alone*, which he can do with *man's* co-operation. Man is only the recipient of God's goodness, who affords him means and opportunity, and finally raises him incorruptible and immortal, without any assistance from man's power. We, therefore, advise Mr. W. to prove, first, that man is a *free agent*, before he says one word more about the absurdity of compelling him, in opposition to his own choice, &c. We ask Mr. W. Do you ever *compel* your children to act differently from their own choice? If you do, you are, on your own confession, palpably absurd.

Mr. W.'s *second* paragraph contains many items. He does not see the necessity of answering our questions. We presume, however, that he saw the

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning the seventeenth, which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first, &c.

difficulty of answering them! We shall see whether Mr. W. has "given a sufficient reason for the permission of the present state of affairs." According to him, the present state of affairs is this, "Man was endowed with *freedom of will*, in order that he might be capable of conjoining himself to his Creator by regeneration," &c. Will man do this? No! Thousands of men, according to Mr. W. will never be regenerated. If this "is a sufficient" reason for the present state of affairs," to pretend that the purposes of God in permitting them, will never be accomplished, we should like to know, what is an insufficient reason? Mr. W. to illustrate his hypothesis we presume, asserts, that "With the great I AM, the *past, present, and future, form one eternal NOW*, on which *foreknowledge* cannot be predicated." Although this declaration is one which is monstrously absurd, we shall admit it, and reason accordingly. Mr. W.'s vultures and owls are *now* vultures and owls, and there is no future, they are now capable of being changed into doves and eagles, and be regenerated by their co-operation. This *eternal now* will always remain, and there always was this *eternal now*, and these vultures and owls always were vultures and owls, without beginning, and without end. So much for an *eternal now*. We think the *eternal now* will remain an eternal absurdity! You must not object that there was a *past time*, when the vultures and owls were not vultures and owls; and that there will be a *future time*, when some of these vultures and owls will become doves and eagles; because there is no time *past, present, nor future*, but only *one eternal now!!* We think there ought to be an eternal *then*, and an eternal *when*, and then a triangle of absurdity could be completed, without a parallel. This eternal now, and the doctrine that three are one, are a good match. Mr. W. in this paragraph makes a number of very positive, and very important assertions, without a shadow of proof, save, we presume, his own "positive conviction." Pray, Sir, give us a little evidence now and then, to season your broad assertions. How many *hells* are there? What do you mean, when you say that God "redeemed man by conquering the hells?" &c. when you at the same time contend, that the hells shall conquer man, so far as to hold him in their bondage? You say, God did not *design* any man for this hell, this state, and cannot be charged with *cruelty*. He made him free, &c. and cannot be either *ignorant* or *impotent*. And to escape altogether, you will have it, that God could not *foreknow* man's destiny, because there is with God *one eternal NOW!* We should be glad to be informed, whether Mr. W. intended this should be received as *argument!* The case stands thus—God *intended* the eternal happiness of the creature. He constituted man so that man might *defeat* his design. If man defeats God's design he goes to hell. But God did not design man for hell, and there is *one eternal now*, and God knew nothing of the consequences of his own works, or of the free will of the creature. Therefore, God cannot be charged with *ignorance* nor *impotence*. We wish we could say as much for Mr. W.

We request Mr. W. to turn his attention to a consequence resulting from his doctrine, which we think will controvert some of his favourite opinions. It is this—Man must be regenerated in this life, and this cannot be effected, even by Omnipotence, without man's assistance. One half of the children of men die in infancy. How will you regenerate *them*? You will please to recollect, you have decided, that without regeneration, man cannot *become receptive of heavenly felicity*. Consequently, you must admit that one half of the human race will never "become receptive of heavenly felicity," or you must admit that your premises are wrong, and that man can be regenerated in another mode of being, or in this mode of being without his *co-operation*. Also, that make the means of salvation to be what you please, you must make it the same for *all*.

We recommend an easy way to escape from the difficulties which surround you. Namely—Admit the *truth*. Confess that *all men*, indiscriminately, will be raised incorruptible, immortal, and glorious in the heavenly image; that then, and not till then, will be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory!* That even *your hells* will be destroyed, and God, heaven and happiness, reign alone and triumph. Confess that God is *Omnipotent*; and man the creature, offspring, and *recipient* of God's mercies. That Omnipotence possesses *all* power, and impotence *no* power. That the devil and his works will be *destroyed*; and the *last* enemy, which is *death*, will be annihilated, when the Devil, who has the *power of death*, is gone to destruction. Believe the declaration, "Behold, the day cometh, [the gospel day,] that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*." (Mal. iv. 1.) Then your owls, swine, vultures, and numerous hells, will be no more, and all men "become receptive of heavenly felicity," in your rejoicing mind.

Mr. W.'s concluding paragraph is a repetition of a former interrogation. Is it not remarkable, that Mr. W. should dispose of our interrogations by *wholesale*, without answering them; omit the insertion of our note or postscript, which had an exclusive relation to his repeated interrogation, and now persist in requesting an answer to the *last* of his interrogations! Mr. W. cannot maintain his hypothesis, without proving Omnipotence to be *impotent*; Wisdom to be *folly*; and Love to be *cruelty!* Therefore, he would have it taken for granted, that because God permits suffering *now*, for a short time, for a good purpose, he will always permit it, when no good can result to the sufferer from the suffering.

To make short work of Mr. W.'s question, "Does God permit his *innocent* creatures to suffer for the *guilty* ones?" we answer—*Yes*. We go farther: An innocent creature, if possessed of a spirit of wisdom and love, like that which dwelt in Christ, must be willing to suffer for a guilty creature, when that suffering will be overruled by God, for *good* to the

guilty. We point to Christ, the *innocent* Lamb of God, suffering on account of guilty men, whom Mr. W. calls owls, swine, and vultures! But Mr. W. will please to understand us to say, that God will never permit his innocent creatures to suffer the *punishment* due to the guilty, for any sins the guilty has committed, to release them from their just punishment. We read of Christ, that he, "for the *suffering* of death was crowned with *glory and honour*." Love will permit momentary suffering to produce a great and lasting good. Omnipotence can effect this; and Infinite Wisdom will sanction the measure.

Note—Will Mr. Woodworth publish this, our reply, to his remarks contained in his last Number?

On the Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures.

BY BISHOP HARE.

(Continued from page 155.)

There are, you know, two clergymen* of the town, who have studied themselves into heresy, or at least into a suspicion of it; both of them, men of fair, unblemished characters; one† has all his life been cultivating piety, and virtue, and good learning. Rigidly constant himself in the public and private duties of religion; and always promoting in others virtue, and such learning as he thought would conduce most to the honour of God, by manifesting the greatness and wisdom of his works. He has given the world sufficient proofs that he has not misspent his time, by very useful works of philosophy and mathematics; he has applied one to the explication of the other, and endeavoured by both to display the glory of the great Creator. And to his study of nature, he early joined the study of the Scriptures; and his attempts, whatever the success be, were at least well meant; and, considering the difficulty of the subjects he engaged in, it must be allowed that in the main they are well aimed; and if he has not succeeded, no more have others who have meddled with the same subjects. Nor is he more to be blamed than they. To be blamed, did I say? I should have said, not less to be commended. For sure it is a commendable design, to explain scripture difficulties, and to remove the objections of profane men, by showing there is nothing in the sacred writings, but what is true and rational.

But what does a life, thus spent, avail? To what purpose so many watchful nights, and weary days? So much piety and devotion? So much mortification and self-denial? Such a zeal to do good, and to be useful to the world? So many noble specimens of a great genius, and of a fine imagination? It is the poor man's misfortune (for poor he is, and like to be, not having the least preferment) to have a warm head, to be very zealous in what he thinks the cause of God. He thinks prudence the worldly wisdom condemned by Christ and his apostles, and that it is gross prevarication and hypocrisy to conceal the discoveries he conceives he has made. This

heat of temper betrays him into some indiscreet expressions and hasty assertions; designing to hurt nobody, he fancies nobody designs to hurt him; and is simple enough to expect the same favourable allowances will be made to him, that he sees made to those who write against him. As to his learning, it is his misfortune that he is not skilled enough in the learned languages to be a great critic in them, and yet seems not to be sensible of his deficiency in this respect. And what advantage is taken of this, that he has not less heat and more criticism? His learning is treated in that manner, that you would think he did not know the first elements of Greek; though, even in that, he is much superior to most of those who make so free with him; and you every day hear his performances run down as whimsies and chimeras, by men who never read them, and, if they did, could not understand them. Nor does this warmth of temper come off better; it is all over obstinacy, pride, and heretical pravity; a want of modesty and due deference to just authority; they, that speak most favourably, look upon him as crazed, and little better than a madman. This is the poor man's character; and, low as he is, they cannot be content to leave him quiet in his poverty; whereas, had he not been early possessed with a passionate love for the scripture and philosophy; had he not thought it his duty above all things to promote the glory of God, and been persuaded that could no way be so well done as by the study of his word and works; it is more than probable he had, at this time, been orthodox; and then, instead of his present treatment, his faults would have been overlooked; the learning he excels in, would have been extolled, and no defect would have been found in other parts of it. He would have been cried up as an ornament of the age, and no preferment would have been denied or envied him.

This you know to be the case with one of the new heretics; the other* is so prudent in his conduct, that he comes under but a suspicion of favouring the same notions. How now is he treated? Prudence in him is as great a crime as the want of it in the other. The imprudent man is treated as a madman, and rank Arian; the prudent one is less a heretic, but more dangerous; *sobrius accessit ad evertendam ecclesiam*; and therefore the greater alarm must be raised against him. And what has he done? Why, he has, with a great deal of pains, brought together, in the best manner he could, all the passages in the New Testament relating to the doctrine of the trinity. And so far his work is what those, who differ from him, should be pleased with, since he has brought the materials together to enable men to form a right judgment of the question in dispute; and has put into their hands, if he be in the wrong, the best weapons against himself. But he has interpreted some texts in a manner that is not liked; it is true, he has so; but not once, that I remember, has he given an interpretation that is purely of his own head. He brings great vouchers, and, if he errs, it is always in good company. This is

* Dr. Samuel Clarke and Professor Whiston.

† Whiston.

* Dr. Samuel Clarke.

his offence; he has maintained, with many others, particularly the late dean of St. Paul's, in opposition to Sabellianism, that the three persons of the trinity are three real distinct beings; and the belief of three really distinct beings perfectly equal, he maintains with Dr. South to be tritheism; and, that there must therefore be a subordination. Now whether this notion be right, or not; if he cannot escape ill treatment, give me leave to say, that, if your study should lead you into any opinion contrary to what is generally received, you can with no reason expect better quarter. He is a man, who has all the good qualities that can meet together to recommend him; he is possessed of all the parts of learning that are valuable in a clergyman, in a degree that few possess any single one; he has joined to a good skill in the three learned languages, a great compass of the best philosophy and mathematics; as appears by his Latin works; and his English ones are such a proof of his own piety, and of his knowledge in divinity, and have done so much service to religion, as would make any other man, that was not under the suspicion of heresy, secure the friendship and esteem of all good churchmen, especially of the clergy. And to all this piety and learning, and the good use that has been made of it, is added a temper happy beyond expression; a sweet, easy, modest, inoffensive, obliging behaviour adorns all his actions; and no passion, vanity, insolence, or ostentation, appear either in what he writes or says; and yet these faults are often incident to the best men, in the freedom of conversation, and in writing against impertinent and unreasonable adversaries, especially such as strike at the foundations of virtue and religion. This is the learning, this the temper of the man, whose study of the Scriptures has betrayed him into a suspicion of some heretical opinions; and, because it has, he must be worried out of the great and clear reputation he is possessed of; and he, that has so many shining qualities, must be insulted by every worthless wretch, as if he had as little learning and virtue as the lowest of those who are against him. What protection now can you promise yourself from your virtue, when a man of such a character cannot be safe in his good name? Whatever therefore you do, be orthodox; orthodoxy will cover a multitude of sins, but a cloud of virtues cannot cover the want of the minutest particle of orthodoxy.

It is expected, no matter how unreasonably, that a man should always adhere to the party he has once taken. It is the opinion of the world, that he is all his life bound by the subscriptions he made in his first years; as if a man were as wise at twenty-four, and knew as much of the scripture and antiquity, and could judge as well of them, as he can at fifty. And yet, if a man will be studying these things, he cannot be sure he shall continue a year together in the same sentiments; and, if he should not, he must either stifle his persuasion, against the dictates of his conscience, or be exposed to the worse treatment, to be called a renegado, a false brother, a heretic, or any thing that malice can suggest.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—The following is from "McCrie's Life of John Knox." If it will not edify the readers of the Gospel Herald, it will at least amuse some of them. It is the conclusion of Knox's "*Letter to the faithfull in Lundowne*," dated Geneva, Feb. 1554. (Reign of Bloody Queen Mary.) Mr. McCrie ushers in this precious *moreceau* thus.

"As a specimen of *impressive* eloquence and *elevated* piety, I cannot refrain from quoting its conclusion; in which he addresses their consciences, their hopes, their fears, and adjures them by all that is sacred, and all that is dear to them as men, as parents, and as Christians, not to *start back* from their profession, and plunge themselves and their posterity into the gulf of ignorance and idolatry."

"Allace! sall we, efter so many graces that God has offeritt in our dayis, for plesure, or for vane threatnyng of thame whome our hart knaweth and our mouthis have confessit to be odious ydolateris, altogidder without resistance turne backe to oure vomit and dampnabill ydolateries to the perdition of uss and oure posteritie? O horribill to be hard! Sall Godis halie preceptis wirk no greter obedience in uus? Sall not fatherlie pitie overcum this cruelnes? I speik to yu, O natural fatheris. Behold your children with the eie of mercie, and consider the end of thair creacion. Crueltie it wer to saif your self, and damp [*damn*] thame. But O! more than crueltie, and madnes, that can not be expressit, gif, [*if*] for the plesure of a moment, ye depryve your selfs and your posteritie of that eternall joie that is ordanit for thame that continewis in confession of Christis name to the ende. Gif naturall lufe, fatherlie affection, reverence of God, feir of torment, or yit hoip of lyfe, move you, than will ye ganestand [*withstand*] that abominabill ydol. Whilk, gif ye do not, than allace! the sonne is gon doune, and the lyht is quyte lost, the trompeit is ceissit, and ydolatrie is placeit quietnesse and rest

* * * Let it be knawn to your posteritie that ye wer Christianis, and no Ydolateris; that ye learnt Chryst in tyme of rest, and baldlie professit hym in tyme of trubill. The preceptis think ye, are schärp and hard to be observit; and yet agane I affirme, that compairit with the plagis that sall assuredlie fall upon obstinat ydolteris, they sallbe fund easie and lyht. For avoyding of ydolatrie ye may perchaunce be compellit to live your native coutrie and reaulme, but obeyris [*obeyers, or those that obey*] of ydolatrie without end sallbe compellit to burne in helle; for avoyding of ydolatrie your substaunce sallbe spoillit, but for obeying ydolatrie heavenly ryches sallbe loste; for avoyding of ydolatrie ye may falle in the handis of earthlie tirantis, but obeyris, manteaneris, and consentaris [*maintainers and consenters*] to ydolatrie schal not eschape the handis of the livinge Godde; for avoyding of ydolatrie your children sallbe depryvit of feyther, frendis, rychis, and of reste, but bie obeyinge ydolatrie they sallbe left without God, without the knowledge of his worde, and without hoip of his kyngdome. Consider, deir brithrene, that how mekill mair [*much more*] dolorus and feirfull it is to be tor-

mentit in helle than to suffer trubill in erthe; to be depyvitt of hevenlie joie, than to be rubbit of transitorie ryches. * * * * * Gif any eschaupt the ugle face and horribill feir of deth, it was thay that baddlie confessit Chryste, befor menne * * *

* * * A stoute marynell, in tyme of tempeste, seeing but one or two schippis, or like weschells to his, pas throughtout any daunger, and to winne a sure harberie, will have gud esperance, [*hope*] by the lyke wynde to do the same. Allace! sall ye be mair feirfull to win lyfe eternall, than the naturall man is to save the corporall lyfe? Hes not the maist part of the sanctis of God from the begynnyng enterit into thair reste by torment and trubillis? and yel what complaynts finde we in thaire mouthis, except it be the lamenting of thair persecuteris? Did God comforte thame? and sall his Majestie despyse us, gif, in fichting against iniquite, we will follow thair fuststeppis? Hie wull notte." W. T.

From the Gospel Advocate.

THE PROGRESS OF UNIVERSALISM.

Richmond, (Ont.) August 10. While preaching from 1 John iv. 14, I cited 1 Tim. iv. 10. The Rev. Mr. Wright, Methodist minister, being present, interrupted me by citing, with peculiar emphasis, the last part of the verse. "I turned and said to him, Sir, you are either ignorant of the language or doctrine of the apostle, for Paul had plainly asserted "God is the Saviour of all men," which proposition was true, and independent of the second in the text, viz. "especially of them that believe." I then observed to the congregation, I feared no consequences, if any gentleman was prepared to address them with greater advantage to the interests of truth and piety, I would immediately yield, being persuaded that none could successfully contradict my discourse, otherwise than by proving the apostles false teachers.

Mr. W. then addressing the people remarked, that I had talked much of Jesus as a Saviour, but never informed them *from what* he saved men. This he thought was of the highest importance. He then told us, Jesus saved them from original sin, and by his death procured an offer of salvation to all men. He asserted salvation to be conditional. Cited Mark xvi. 16. and exclaimed, what damnation is this? If the wicked receive all their punishment in this world, the righteous must also receive their reward, consequently, there is no heaven nor salvation after death. God could not save men in their sins, and if they died in them they must go to hell. He then referred to 2 Cor. v. 11, spoke of the terrors of the Lord. Here he began to vociferate and beat the desk most tremendously. He afterwards observed that I laboured to make men Universalists, not Christians, but because he knew the terrors of the Lord, he warned them against me as one of the false prophets spoken of, Ezek. xiii. Here he ended his parody.

I replied, The angel commanded Joseph to call his son Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins, not merely from original sin, as Mr. W.

had asserted. If Jesus saved men from original sin only, then he was no Saviour, and the name was misapplied. If God damned men to all eternity, could he torment them any longer? If not, of what advantage is the pardon of original sin? Secondly, If God cannot save man in his sins, who shall save him? If man must be delivered from his sins before God, or Christ became his Saviour, can either of them be called a Saviour? Is not man his own saviour? What salvation does he need, when he has freed himself from sin? As to the words damned, damnation, there is not a word in all the original Scriptures which will bear to be so translated. This will appear evident by translating the original word damned, wherever it occurs. Thus he that believeth not shall be damned. Mark xvi. 16. The Father damneth no man, but has committed all damnation to the Son, John v. 22. God sent his Son not to damn the world. John iii. 17. Who then can damn men? If God and Christ do not, can the devil? If so he must be more potent than the Almighty, for he wills that all should be saved. 1 Tim. ii. 4. and sent his Son to save the world. 1 John iv. 14, and to destroy the devil and his works. Heb. ii 14. 1 John iii 8. Mr. W. infers that if the words of Solomon be true, Prov. ii. 31, those of Peter must be false, 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. But let him read his Bible before he undertakes to combat Universalism, and he will find answers to all his ignorant and irreverent objections. About the meaning of Ezek. xiii. I will not contend, Jer. xxiii. from the 23d to the 33d verses, will answer my purpose. God says, "*he is against the dreamers that use their tongues, and say he saith.*" Jude also speaks of filthy dreamers. As Mr. W. is unable to support his opinions by Biblical testimony, let him go to the credulous dupes of superstition, to publish his dreams, and proclaim the terrors of a fanatic imagination. We say to men, Fear not. God is love, and the Lord God Omnipotent reigns alone.

Mendon, (Monroe) Aug. 13. Preached from Isa. iii. 12. After service, five Methodist preachers assembled for combat. The Rev. Mr. Williams commenced the attack, by demanding If I believed God had foreordained whatsoever comes to pass?

Thompson. I believe and teach God has foreordained the salvation of the whole human family, and will bring it to pass.

W. I am requested to ask you to reply, yes, or no, to my questions, without any qualification or illustration.

T. I am not a Calvinist, neither came I to discuss the doctrine of necessity. If you desire information on that subject, read the works of Leibnitz, Hartley, and Priestly.

W. I beg to decline the perusal of these authors, and demand a reply to my first question.

T. Sir, if your question include all things, even the most minute, I reply, no: for I do not believe God foreordained a child to cry, and its nurse to rock the cradle.

W. I am desired to change the question, and ask, Do you believe God has decreed all moral events or actions?

T. Sir, I believe you do not intend to discuss the subject fairly, but to obtain an opportunity of exciting against me the prejudices of the vulgar. If you insist on a reply, I must be allowed to ask you, Do you believe God foreknew whatsoever comes to pass?

W. We came not to answer, but to ask questions.

T. Then you confirm my suspicion of your intentions. I teach, God hath predestined all men to eternal salvation, according to the good pleasure of his will, and that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, and refer you to Ephesians i. 4-12.

W. We believe that God decreed that all might be saved if they would.

T. Then you believe God decreed just nothing, or that he decreed his will, should be determined by man's.

W. You will not come to terms. Therefore we will not continue the debate.

T. The terms are evident, I came here to preach the salvation of all men; you to calumniate the doctrine. If you are able to refute it, I pray you proceed—

W. You will not commence at the beginning.

T. God determined to create and beatify a world of mankind, there is the beginning. He governs them according to his good purpose, there is the middle; and he will effect the salvation of all his intelligent offspring, there is the end. Now, gentlemen, you have the beginning, middle, and end of God's designs, and of my preaching, and you feel yourselves unable to oppose either.

Here a motion was made by the Rev. Mr. Weeks for an adjournment, and the appointment of a committee to determine the subject, and manner of debate. During some altercation which followed, an aged man stood up, and addressed the audience.

Gentlemen—I have come twelve miles to hear this debate. I wish to know before I return, whether the Salvationists or Damnationists shall gain the victory. If the Salvationists, I go home rejoicing. If not, I shall return mourning. Gentlemen, I have a family, and I love them. (Here the tears flowed copiously, and the man showed great agitation.) Having stood speechless for some time, he recovered and proceeded. Gentlemen, I fear not for myself. For twenty years, my faith in the Divine Mercy has remained unshaken, but I feel for others. O, let me know if I may reasonably hope for the salvation of my family.

T. Men, women, and children, go to your homes, congratulate each other, we are all about to meet shortly in heaven. Tell your neighbours, here are several Methodist preachers, who are unable to cite a single text for the existence of hell or the devil, or the punishment of the wicked, after death. I have preached to you the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. If you love your neighbours as well as yourselves, you will come to hear me, but if you are partial and malevolent, and desire to see the destruction of those who may have offended you, then you will go to hear these Methodist ministers, who preach the horrid doctrine, that God hates his

creatures, and will send the greater part of them to endless misery.

The audience was then dismissed, and the meeting adjourned until Wednesday, the 27th inst.

J. S. THOMPSON.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

TO MR. JOHN DITCHETT:

Dear Sir—I write to inform you, that I have recently had a conversation with an individual relative to the matter at issue between Mr. Wm. Roy and yourself; and I consider it my duty to acknowledge myself to have been in error, in charging you with wilful falsehood, in my letter to W. R., which appeared in a previous Number of the G. H. And I would observe, that, however we may differ in our views of W. R.'s Sermon, I am nevertheless persuaded, that what you have written on the subject, has been the dictates of your conscience.

Yours, with respect,

WM. H. HYATT.

Newark, Sept. 29, 1823.

REMARKS.

The above letter is considered by Mr. D. to be sufficient to exculpate him from all blame, predicated on Mr. Hyatt's former letter. He rests the statements he has made, on the evidence previously adduced. Those who are acquainted with the parties will require no other. Those who are unacquainted with the parties, can inform themselves, if they feel interested.

Thus far, we have been a spectator of the scene. There is one circumstance, however, which we are privy to, which has an important bearing on Mr. Hyatt's former letter. But, before we relate it, we declare, that no witnesses can be produced on the opposite side to disprove our assertions; and as we shall relate only the *plain truth*, we shall leave it to the mercy of our friends, and our foes too, if we have any. We give the relation, because we are requested to do so.

The Monday previous to the appearance of Rev. W. Roy's reply to D. J.'s first statement, in the Gospel Herald of that week, the editor of this paper returned to this city, from Morristown, (N. J.) Stopping at Newark, while the driver was resting his horses, he was accosted in the bar-room at Mr. Bonnell's Tavern, by a stranger, and asked for the Herald of the preceding week, and whether Mr. Roy had published a reply to Mr. Ditchett's statement? The stranger was answered in the negative; and asked whether he was present when the Sermon in question was delivered? He replied, he was. He was then told, he could give his opinion relative to Mr. Ditchett's being correct in his statement. He said he could; and he considered D.'s statement to be incorrect. The stay at the Tavern was short. On passing through the entry of the house, to the stage, the stranger said his name was Hyatt. That he was sorry Mr. Ditchett had not procured a copy of the whole sermon, and published it to the world; for it was, without exception, the most absurd discourse he had ever heard.

Having heard Mr. Hyatt express himself, as above related, we were surprised to see his letter in vindication of the "*most absurd discourse he had ever heard.*" We shall not accuse Mr. H. of any unjustifiable motives in the erratic course he has pursued. The readers of the G. H., we trust, will not require any thing more explanatory of this affair. Mr. D.'s statement is proved by the simple fact, that a gentleman, (Mr. Pierson,) of the Presbyterian persuasion, at Newark, who heard the sermon delivered, related; from memory, in the presence of a number of spectators, the declarations contained in Mr. D.'s statement, with the exception of two, which he remembered, after he read the statement itself. It is almost, if not quite impossible, for this coincidence to happen, and Mr. D.'s statement to be *false*. ED.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—In the Gospel Herald for Sept. 13, page 144, I observed some remarks relative to a declaration made by Br. Case, "that Christ was ignorant of the time when Jerusalem was to be destroyed." I know that many critics have questioned the genuineness of the passage, as found in the common version, and have omitted in their translation the words "*neither the Son.*" How far their opinion is entitled to credit, I leave to those whose literary attainments better enable them to decide; suffice it to say, that all manuscripts now extant retain it, and that it was cited by the early writers; it is also retained in the Improved version. Were we to admit the words "*neither the Son,*" to be an interpolation, I do not see that the argument in question would be very materially affected by it, for sufficient would yet remain to prove Christ ignorant of that event. The passage would then read, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, but the Father." What language could Christ have used which would more clearly have expressed the ignorance of every being but the Father, concerning that day? Notwithstanding, some have ventured the assertion, that if Christ did not know the exact time of the destruction of Jerusalem, he must have been ignorant of Daniel's prophecy. That this is a mistaken idea, will appear obvious on consulting Mark, chap. xiii. In the 4th verse, we find Christ's disciples inquiring of him, "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" He proceeds to give them a description of that awful event, but does not inform them of the day and hour in which it would take place, but merely speaks of the certain fulfilment of the prophecy during that age. See verses 30 and 32, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be done—But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, but the Father."

The subject is expressed with so much clearness in these passages, that I think the unprejudiced reader must acknowledge the inconsistency of contending for the Omniscience of Christ. By giving these broken hints a place in your valuable paper, you will oblige a young correspondent. E. P. A.

Mount Pleasant, Sept. 22, 1823.

REMARKS.

We consider the fifth chapter of John's Gospel to contain a true account of Christ's powers, as given by himself. Christ declares that he can do nothing independent of the Father; but he also declares, "The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him *all things* that himself doeth," &c. It is a truth, that no man knoweth any thing before it takes place, unless God communicates the knowledge. Thus the prophets were enlightened, and enabled to foretell the happening of future events. Christ declares of John, that there hath not risen a greater prophet. Of himself, that he has greater witness. And John declares of Christ, that he was unworthy to unloose the latchet of Christ's shoes. If "the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," the Son must possess the *knowledge*, as well as the *prerogative* of the judge. At the time Christ made the declaration, himself excepted, there was not a prophet living, to whom had been communicated a knowledge of God's purposes. The day and hour was known to no man. Christ speaks of himself, as the *Son*, and says, "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save [except] he which is of God, *he hath seen the Father.*" Again, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom [the knowledge, &c.] of the Father, he hath declared." That is, made known concerning God. If these testimonies are true, they prove that Christ knew the day and hour spoken of, and possessed wisdom and knowledge in a greater degree than all that had gone before, or shall come after him. Christ, therefore, knew more than the prophet Daniel.

From Locke's on the Human Understanding.

"But notwithstanding a great noise is made in the world about errors and opinions, I must do mankind that right, as to say, *there are not so many men in errors, and wrong opinions, as is commonly supposed.* Not that I think they embrace the truth; but indeed because concerning those doctrines they keep such a stir about, they have no thought, no opinion at all. For if any one should a little catechise the greatest part of the Partizans of most of the sects in the world, he would not find, concerning those matters they are so zealous for, that they have any opinions of their own: much less would he have reason to think, that they took them upon the examination of arguments, and appearance of probability. They are resolved to stick to a party that education or interest has engaged them in; and there, like the common soldiers of an army, show their courage and warmth as their leaders direct, without ever examining, or so much as knowing the cause they contended for. If a man's life shows that he has no serious regard for religion, for what reason should we think, that he beats his head about the opinions of his church, and troubles himself to examine the grounds of this or that doctrine? It is enough for him to obey his leaders, to have his hand and his tongue ready for the support of the common cause, and thereby approve himself to those who can give him credit, preferment, or protection in

their society. Thus men become professors of, and combatants for, those opinions they never were convinced of, nor *proselytes* to; no, nor ever had so much as floating in their heads; and though one cannot say there are fewer improbable or erroneous opinions in the world than there are, yet this is certain, there are fewer that actually assent to them, and mistake them for truths, than is imagined."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—By giving your thoughts relative to the propriety of singing Hymns which contain confessions of our *unworthiness*, before God, a place in the Gospel Herald, a Subscriber will consider himself much obliged. E. P.

REMARKS.

We must confess we have not considered the subject now introduced by E. P. until on the present occasion. Hymns are professedly sung to the praise of God. Will singing our *unworthiness* praise him? A prophet says, "Make a joyful noise unto the God of Jacob," &c. Surely we cannot rejoice, nor praise God because we are unworthy. It appears to us, that singing a Hymn which is a mere recapitulation of our sins, &c. can never praise God. There is a sense, however, in which our *unworthiness* may be expressed in our songs of praise to God, and God be praised by the mention of our imperfections. We are exhorted to "praise the Lord," because "He is good;" and it is proved that he is good, when it is added, "*for his mercy endureth for ever.*" The mercy of God is exercised towards unworthy sinners. Therefore, our *unworthiness* may be mentioned, coupled with God's mercy, and his great goodness, which even our *unworthiness* cannot hinder from being exercised to reclaim and sanctify us. Our *unworthiness*, therefore, may be mentioned, as we would recount to the praise of a good physician, the terrible malady from which his benevolence and skill had saved his patient.

FAITH IN THE PROMISES.

At a religious meeting, in a country village, a short time since, it was proposed to call a meeting of prayer, for rain, &c. It was assented to, suggesting the propriety of waiting the return of their minister, who was absent. But the first mover of the measure, looked out of the window, and observed, "It is very *dry now*," &c. It was concluded best to appoint the following Wednesday for a prayer meeting for rain. Wednesday came; but Tuesday came first, and with it, a plentiful shower!

Query. How did it happen that these pious folks doubted the goodness of God, in "sending seed time and harvest;" when we read, that "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good; and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust?"

NEWS.

The Editor of the Commercial Advertiser, solicited the attention of the public to a notice in his paper of Dr. Cumming, of his preaching a sermon on Tuesday evening last, in the Rev. J. Chase's

church, to obtain a benefit for the Ministers of Oneida and Cayuga, to enable them to purchase useful books. This *knowing* editor said, "The value of knowledge to them, and to the community at large, is admitted on all hands. Nay, 'tis *essential* to the perpetuity of our liberties, and all our excellent civil institutions." Here is a *new spur* for an *old* occasion. The Ministers of Oneida and Cayuga, are to teach the community at large, and their teaching, we presume, is essential to preserve our *civil institutions*. Query. Have the Ministers of Oneida and Cayuga no books, save "*The history of Tom Thumb*?" Where is the "Bible Society?" Surely they ought to give each of them a Bible.

DENUNCIATION OF THE HON. JOHN JAY.

Mr. Wilson, in his Witness for July, thus arraigns the venerable President of the American Bible Society:—"When, however, an error of a very *dangerous tendency* is uttered, no reputation of him who utters it; no zeal for the success of the great and good cause; no admiration of Bible institutions, ought to shield it from merited reproof." Here he quotes the heretical sentence. "The divine attributes," says the President, "forbid us to suppose that the Almighty Sovereign of the Universe will permit any part of his empire to remain for ever in a state of revolt. On the contrary, the sacred Scriptures assure us, that it shall not only be reduced to obedience, but also be so purified and improved, as that righteousness and felicity shall dwell and abide in it." So far Mr. Jay, and now for Mr. W.'s comments. "Here is plainly stated, and OPENLY AVOWED, the doctrine of Universal Salvation—the salvation of all men and of Devils," &c.

This reformed Presbyterian editor cannot find any body who is *exactly right* but himself. Plain Truth.

NEWS FROM A FAR COUNTRY.

We have received another letter from our brother Worrall, Pastor of the Universalist Church in Glasgow, (Scotland,) communicating tidings of good things. Also, the first two Numbers of the "GOSPEL COMMUNICATOR," a new publication, edited by our brother Worrall, and proclaiming the "Great Salvation."

Selected.

THOUGHTS ON THE EQUINOX.

Now o'er the Equatorial way
The sun's bright car is driven;
And equal night and equal day,
To every country given.

Fair emblem of that Love Divine,
Whose rich impartial grace,
Shall in its boundless grasp entwine
The whole of Adam's race.

Though clouds and darkness here below
Impede its bright career,
Yet faith shall all its glory know,
In heaven's immortal year.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on Friday Evenings at seven o'clock. The object of this society is one of universal interest. All religious denominations therefore, are invited to attend.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1823.

NO. 23.

ANOTHER EXCOMMUNICATION.

The following is an account of the excommunication of a member from the communion of the Rev. J. Chase's Church, in Delancey-street, in this city, for believing the testimony of "all God's holy prophets," and denying the testimony of *Calvin's* prophets.

TO THE BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH:

Dear Brethren—It is with the greatest pleasure that I am called upon by reason and my own feelings, to give you "a reason of the hope that is in me, with meekness and fear." But before I proceed directly to this, I cannot refrain from noticing the unjust manner of your proceedings towards me, in which you have gone contrary to your own covenant; for the eighth article of your covenant reads as follows—"Any member who shall dissent from this covenant, or deviate from the articles of church discipline, shall have no voice or membership in the church, after the measure has been taken agreeably to article third," &c. Article third. "Members may apply to any officer of the church for advice, on matters of discipline, not divulging more than is necessary to obtain satisfactory information on the subject. However, if a member feel aggrieved or injured by another member, they are first to go to that member *alone*, and tell him or her of the fault; in case the matter should not be settled, then take one or two more along that they may try to settle the difficulty; but if they cannot, the complaint may be made known to one of the officers of the church, who may try to settle it or report it to the church, if he should think proper, and request the parties to attend a church meeting. If the church find the complaint just, and the parties obstinate, they shall be suspended from communion, and admonished to a compliance of what the church thinks right; when if they continue obstinate, they may have until the second or even until the third monthly church meeting to consider the matter, when if they remain obstinate, they shall be cut off from all privilege of the church." Now, allowing that the church felt aggrieved or injured in consequence of my change of sentiment, have you acted towards me according to the above cited article? Certainly not; for instead of the member, who understood that I had embraced Universalism, waiting on, and endeavouring to reclaim me, from what he considered to be an error, he immediately mentioned it to the church, and requested that a committee should be appointed to wait on me, which was accordingly done; and one of this committee mentioned the same to me, (which was the first I knew of the church taking up a labour with me,) and requested me to mention

when it would be convenient for me to have them call on me. The time was appointed; when they accordingly came, and after about two hour's conversation, in which time the most prominent passages (of scripture) were brought forward which are generally quoted, to prove the unmerciful sufferings of our fellow men, and I had given them my opinion of them, according to the understanding I trust the Lord hath given me of them, they promised me I should have a hearing before the church, which has not been granted me.

I do not attach any blame to the committee, for in the visit they made me they manifested a christian spirit towards me, for which I shall ever feel grateful, and esteem them as my christian brethren, although differing from me in sentiment. I am also informed, they used their best endeavours to procure for me a hearing, but it was all in vain. It would not answer for a *Universalist* to speak before the church; and the reason was, (as I am informed,) you were afraid of my proselyting your members, or entangling some youthful minds. If this was the case, and I have no reason to doubt it, your cause must be a deplorable one indeed. For unless it was, you would not be afraid of letting your members hear for *themselves* the doctrine I have embraced. It was also stated by one of your members, that it would be out of order to let an *infidel* speak before the church, when you had excommunicated a member for only believing Arminianism, and joining a Methodist society. But, doubtless brethren, you will recollect, you have always made it an uniform practice on all occasions, to give members a hearing before the church, who may differ from you in sentiment; provided they have not joined themselves with another society. How it can be said, that I am an *infidel*, I cannot conceive, unless infidelity consists in believing that there is *one* uncreated, self-existent, and Almighty First Cause, who is possessed of infinite goodness, power, and wisdom; who is the Father of our spirits, and the former of our bodies; who is the Disposer of all events, and who works all things after the counsel of his *own will*, which is the salvation of *all* men; whose nature and essence is Love; and who has made a revelation of his will to his creature man, in which is contained all the doctrines of Christianity, &c. If this is *infidelity*, all who have professed the Christian religion are infidels in a greater or less degree; while Paine, Voltaire, and all who have denied the authenticity of the Scriptures, are men of fidelity!

As there is a possibility that this member's mind is so entangled with Calvinism as not to know the

difference between infidelity and Universalism, I shall notice what, in my mind, is not the least among the minor mysteries of the day, viz. The church is divided in opinion, one part believing in *Calvinism*, and the other in, what is generally termed, *Fullerism*, and each party professing their willingness to believe in Universalism in preference to the other's doctrine; yet when one of either party embraces the doctrine of the "restitution of all things," both parties join in excommunicating him from their society. Brethren, I have thought much on this, and cannot account for it on any other ground than this, that "*Herod and Pilate* were made friends the same day."

Brethren, as you would not suffer a despised believer in God's unbounded goodness to all his intelligent offspring, to speak before the church, condescend to notice the reasons of my changing my faith. In the first place—It is well known, at least to some of you, on my becoming a member with you, I embraced the leading principles of Calvinism; and, in process of time, drank deep in the spirit of Calvin. (That is in his principles.) I not only embraced but strenuously contended for them, among the small circle of my acquaintance, and was thought by them to be a most rigid Calvinist; and no doubt they saw the doctrine more free from errors than I did myself, for there was always certain difficulties attending my belief, which I could not solve, but still I was honest. I could see no other way. For having it rooted into me from my infancy, that a portion of mankind would be endlessly miserable, when I come to read the Scriptures for myself, I thought if this was the case, it must have been the will of the Almighty from all eternity: for I am there taught, that his will is like himself, *unalterable*. And that whatsoever he desireth, even that he doeth. Think it not strange, brethren, when I tell you I was frequently unhappy. For there was always a certain gloom in my breast, not particularly for myself, for I thought that I was one of the *elect*; but for those whom I considered to be objects of God's never-ending and implacable vengeance. Ofttimes I have looked at an *innocent infant* in the arms of its mother, and thought, (and in reason too, if the doctrine of reprobation be true) perhaps you are one of the reprobate, and an object of God's hatred. This would chill my blood, palsy every nerve, and render me unspeakably unhappy; for I could not be happy if any of my fellow beings were endlessly miserable. In this revèry the words of Christ, like so many peals of thunder, would cross my mind, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." But still I could not believe the despised doctrine of Universalism. Some, I thought, must be miserable in a future world; and if this was the case, the doctrine of reprobation must be true, for Deity cannot be disappointed. But, thanks be to God, brethren, the gloom of *Calvinism* is chased from my mind, by the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, through which *life and immortality* are brought to light, for a fallen world. I no more view the Father of our spirits, as wrathful and implacable

towards unborn infants, and consigning to ceaseless and inexpressible wo, myriads of human beings.

Instead of having these gloomy views of Deity, I now look up to him as the Father of the spirits of *all flesh*; loving all his offspring, delighting in their happiness, and desiring the misery of none. For, "GOD IS LOVE; and he that loveth not knoweth not God." 1 John iv. 8. If God is *love*, all his dealings towards his creature man must be in loving-kindness; for love thinketh no evil; and whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son he receiveth." Heb. xii 6. And "God so *loved the world*, that he gave his only begotten Son," &c. John iii. 16. The motive in chastising whom he loveth, is the following—"For they, (our earthly fathers) verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure, but he (God) for our profit, that we might be made partakers of his holiness." Heb. xii. 10. Again. "The Lord doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men. To crush under his feet all the prisoners of the earth, to turn aside the right of man before the Most High." Lamentation iii. 33, 34, 35. "But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his tender mercies. (32d verse) For the Lord is gracious and *full of compassion*, slow to anger, and of *great mercy*. The Lord is good to *all*, and his tender mercies are over all his works. All thy works shall praise thee, O Lord; and thy saints shall bless thee." Psalm cxlv. 8, 9, 10. If all his works praise him, they will all be brought to glorify God, for "he that offereth praise glorifieth the Lord." Psalm l. 23. For "he shall send Jesus which before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive until the times of *restitution of all things*, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 20, 21. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Genesis xii. 3. "Ye are the children of the prophets; and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." Acts iii. 25. "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Galatians iii. 8. "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name." Psalm lxxvi. 9. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee, for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is governor among the nations." Psalm xxii. 27, 28. "Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth, righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me *every knee shall bow*, *every tongue shall swear*, surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, to him shall come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." Isaiah xlv. 22—24.

With this compare Romans x. 10. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with

the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Also Isaiah lv. 10, 11. "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it." "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord, wherefore turn and live ye." Ezek. xviii. 30. Compare this with Isaiah xlii. 10. "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." Then the sinner must turn and live. "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the gentiles, to open the blind eyes, (not a part of them,) to bring out the prisoners (not help them out) from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." Isaiah xlii. 6, 7. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 23, 24. "Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Timothy ii. 5, 6. "For the love of Christ constraineth us because we thus judge, if one died for all then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto him who died for them and rose again." 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. See also 19th verse. "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."

Again. "We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." 1 John iv. 14. "And he is the propitiation for our (the elect's) sins, and not for ours (the elect's) only, but for the sins of the whole world." ii. 2. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." John iii. 17. "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world." vi. 33. "As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." xvii. 2. And the Father speaking saith, "All souls are mine." Christ saith, "All that the Father hath he hath given unto the Son; and this is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day." vi. 39.

Brethren, please to read the whole book of John attentively, for the benevolence of our heavenly Father toward the human family is proved in every passage. Again. "Now we know, that what things soever the law saith it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Romans iii.

19. "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." Galatians iv. 4, 5. Surely the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come unto Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads. And in this mountain (Zion) the Lord of hosts hath made unto all people a feast of fat things, &c. And God himself shall wipe away tears from all faces, and the rebuke of his people (the Jews) shall he take from off all the earth. This is truth, for the Lord hath spoken it. It is for believing these testimonies, that I am excluded from your society, and called a *heretic* and *infidel*; but these opprobrious names do not destroy that peace of mind I have, in placing unlimited confidence in these promises of God. But, on the contrary, I rejoice in believing, with joy unspeakable and full of glory. My mind is calm and reposed; trusting in the veracity of God for the fulfilment of his promise; looking forward with joy to the time, when the mystery of God shall be accomplished which he hath spoken to his prophets, when all things shall be gathered together in Christ. Then, the *Devil* and his *works* will all be *destroyed*; for which purpose Christ came, and took that flesh and blood of which all nations are made. Then shall the *whole creation* be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God; and all who have died in Adam, shall, in Christ, their spiritual head, be made alive. For he is the *Head of every man*, the first born of every creature, and all who have borne the image of the earthly man shall also bear the image of the heavenly. And when Christ shall have subdued all things unto him, then shall he also be subject unto the Father, that God may be all in all. Then will our fallen world be made the recipients of immortality and endless life. For Christ says, "Because I live, ye shall live also." And he is "made after the power of an *endless life*." Then will the triumphant song be sung, by every creature—"O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" Even so, Lord Jesus, let it be. Amen! HALLELUJAH!

WM. WHITE.

New-York, October 14, 1823.

On the Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures.

BY BISHOP HARE.

(Continued from page 172.)

Let me observe one thing more, that it is the misfortune of a clergyman that he is confined to one profession. Other men, if they cannot live in one way, are at liberty to try another; but a man that has once the indelible character, must live by the one profession he has made his choice. If, therefore, that livelihood be taken from him, it is in vain he has learning, parts, industry, and application. He will not be allowed to take any other course to repair the loss he suffers by his opinions as a clergyman. His time, and fortune, and studies, have been spent to make him useful in that one profession; and, if he had abilities to maintain himself

in any other, it is too late; he has made his choice, and must abide by it. This then is the unhappy dilemma a reputed heretic is reduced to; he will neither be suffered to *keep* the profession, nor to *leave* it; he shall neither live *in* it, nor *out* of it. So that, notwithstanding his learning, parts, virtue, and industry; though he could make a good lawyer, physician, merchant, or mechanic; if he be not orthodox, all possibilities of living comfortably, at least, and reputably, are taken from him. Go now, and think, if you can, that the advice I give you is not the advice of a friend. It is the advice of one who loves virtue and learning, who is a friend to all good men, and in particular greatly concerned for your success and advancement in the world. It is advice seconded by the examples of the greatest men; for, name me any one of the men most famed for learning, in this, or the last age, who has seriously turned himself to the study of the Scriptures. I might name to you the most eminent men, down from Scaliger and Casaubon, to the present time. Capellus, indeed, and that excellent Grotius, are exceptions; but they met with such usage, that one has little encouragement from their examples. But not to go beyond our own country; who are the men who have excelled most (excepting always Sir Isaac Newton) in philosophy, astronomy, and mathematics? Have they not been clergymen? And was not their skill in these sciences, the effect of their great and constant application to them? Was not that time spent in these studies, that you think should have been applied to the Study of the Scriptures? On the other hand, take out two or three from so great a body, and where is there a clergyman of a great genius, and that has made a chief figure in the learned world, that has written upon the Scriptures, at least with any masterly skill in criticism?

And what is it that all this can be imputed to? Did these learned men decline this study, because they wanted the abilities proper for it? Surely that will not be said of men of their confessed learning. Or was there want of inclination and good will to it? No; they were men of virtue, and good protestants, as well as scholars and men of letters. What then? Did they, who have taken so much pains upon other books, and with so much success, think the Scriptures the only ones that needed not their help? Neither can that be pretended. They saw the sacred books, through the injury of time and the ignorance of scribes, had suffered as well as others; and much more by false and absurd interpretations. To be plain, the one thing that turned them from so noble and necessary a study, was want of *liberty*, which, in this study only, is denied men. They found it was dangerous to examine impartially, and speak freely; that they must write without liberty, or with no safety; that it would be expected of them to strain all their wit and learning, to patronise and palliate gross errors, instead of exposing or mending them: and to support the received interpretations, however absurd, instead of such as reason and learning convinced them were the only true ones. But this was a task

which men of ingenuous minds, whose integrity and love of truth were equal to their penetration and great abilities, could not submit to. For men to have eyes and understandings of their own, and yet not see and understand, but as they were bid, and that by men who could not see or understand themselves—to make such a blind use of their learning and abilities was, they thought, to pervert the very end of them, and really to dishonour God, whose service they were given for. Since, therefore, they could not bear the thoughts of studying the Scriptures on these terms, no part was left men who could not be idle, but to turn to some other study, in which, without fear of danger or offence, they might freely go whither truth and reason led. The consequence of which, besides the improvements made in arts and sciences, has been, that many of them have separately made more good emendations, and happily explained more difficulties in the smallest pagan writers, than they have done, take them all together, in two hundred years, upon the whole body of the Scriptures.

What then I would advise you, is, to follow such examples. Turn yourself to the study of the heathen historians, poets, orators, and philosophers. Spend ten or twelve years upon Horace or Terence. To illustrate a billet-doux, or a drunken catch; to explain an obscene jest; to make a happy emendation on a passage, that a modest man would blush at, will do you more credit, and be of greater service to you, than the most useful employment of your time upon the Scriptures, unless you can resolve to conceal your sentiments, and speak always with the vulgar. You see a present example in the great Bentley; what a reputation has he acquired by the noble edition he has given of Horace! How are his abilities confessed and admired by all! But had the same genius, the same sagacity and labour, been applied to the study of the Scriptures, to settle the texts in doubtful places, to mend corrupted ones, explain hard ones, fix the meaning of obscure ones, and to trace out the literal sense where it can be done; should he, I say, have attempted a work of this kind, instead of thanks and applause, it is more than probable, he would have been treated as a rash man, of no judgment, and less religion; and if his works had been sentenced to the flames, a majority would have been for throwing him in after them.

Consider well, therefore, how you engage where there is no retreat, no repentance, no room for pardon, if you once offend. You have two ways before you. *One* will enable you to be useful in the world, without great trouble to yourself; it will crown your labours with success; it will bring you to reputation and esteem; it will put you into a way of making a decent provision for your family, and giving a good education to those two fine children God has blessed you with, and you may have many more. *The other* will itself fatigue you with many difficulties, and expose you to the most fatal consequences; it will draw on you an insupportable load of infamy, as a disturber of the church, and an enemy to the orthodox faith, and, in all probability,

end in the extreme poverty and ruin of yourself and family. Which God forbid should ever be the case of one, who has no other views but to dedicate his life to God's service.

I am, Sir, your faithful humble servant.
(To be concluded in our next.)

From the Gospel Advocate.

THE PROGRESS OF UNIVERSALISM.

(Concluded from page 174.)

August 27, met according to adjournment. The house being incapable of receiving the people, men were sent to erect seats in the woods. In the mean time, our Methodist brethren invited the people to a capacious and elegant church, lately erected in Mendon. The Rev. J. Badger, and T. Dixon, Esq. being appointed chairmen, and Dr. Neikerbroker, and Dr. Allen, secretaries, the subject of debate was demanded.

Thompson. Every man must know that the subject is, whether all men or only a few shall be saved.

Williams. Mr. Thompson has asserted there is no punishment after death. Let him maintain or abandon the assertion.

T. Mr. Williams and his brethren, preach the doctrine of endless misery. Let them support their sentiments. Notwithstanding, if they acknowledge the restitution of all things, or admit that they are unable to oppose the final salvation of all men, I will then maintain the full, free, and eternal salvation of all mankind.

W. You are bound to do so. We have met you to combat that sentiment. You have said five Methodist Elders had agreed to debate, and you were willing to grant them their own terms.

T. I suppose there are twice that number of you, but I care not whether there be five or fifty-five. You appear like men shut up in a city, strongly besieged and bombarded by the enemy. Conscious that your stores are scanty, and the enemy powerful and vigorous, you are desirous of being as parsimonious as possible. Have your own terms.

W. Prove your doctrine, that all pain is temporal.

T. I have asserted the doctrine, it is yours to disprove what I have affirmed.

W. We wish to hear your manner of defence.

T. Professors of the religion of Jesus—At the age of fifteen I determined to be a minister of Christ. Since that period of life, twenty years have been spent searching for truth, which I ever have considered as a pearl of great price. Matt. xiii. 46. I am forced to become your preacher on this occasion. Forced, did I say? O, no! My soul exults in God my Saviour, that ever he counted me faithful, by putting me into the ministry. Assisted by a liberal education, and I trust an unprejudiced mind, I have laboured night and day, till it has pleased God that the films of ignorance and prejudice should fall from my eyes. Now I regard my opponents as the Sadducees to whom Jesus says, Matt. xxii. 29, 30, "You do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they are as the angels of God in heaven."

Yes, my hearers, these men are ignorant of the

Scriptures concerning the resurrection, and of God's almighty transforming power, which shall change our vile bodies into his own likeness. Shall any of Adam's offspring, rise in sinful unhappy circumstances at the resurrection? Jesus, faithful and true witness! thou shalt decide, "They are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke xx 36. Read Rom. iii. 19-21, and 1 Cor. xv. from the 35th verse to the end. See also Phil. iii. 21, and 1 John iii. 2; then permit me to ask, have not Jesus, Paul, and John, for ever settled the controversy? O, yes, your consciences will affirm, your attachment to the religion of Jesus will compel you to admit, that in the resurrection all shall be happy. Shall my opponents pretend that the witnesses contradict themselves? If they attempt to maintain this, they will ruin their own cause as well as mine; for in doing so, they will overturn the evidences of Christianity. Though I believe the argument drawn from the resurrection is as immovable as the pillars of heaven, yet I can bring additional evidence before you, when needed. My opponents will not dare to deny that God loved the whole world, when he gave his Son to die for it. Zephaniah iii. 17, declares, "God shall rest in his love." John says, "Those whom Christ loved once, he loves to the end." John xiii. 1. "God's love is everlasting." Jer xxxi. 3. O, my fellow preachers, renounce a God that will save to-day, and damn to-morrow; he is not worthy your confidence. In him you cannot find rest for your souls! Jehovah, the Father of us all, is Almighty, infinitely wise and good. As soon shall the eternal reservoir of means, which Jehovah has in his eternal power, be exhausted, as he shall suffer one of his little ones to fall into the regions of despair, or divine abandonment.

W. Jesus says, few shall be saved; and Paul, that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting destruction. (Here he commented.)

T. I predicted that my opponents would endeavour to make Christ contradict himself. If they had read their Bibles, they would have known that the terms saved, salvation, are used in a temporal as well as spiritual sense; and the terms destruction, annihilation, or, at least, decomposition, consequently, there can be no pain after death.

W. I can cite a passage where you must admit, destroyed does not mean to annihilate. "O, Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself. Destroy this body, and I will raise it up."

T. Jesus says, destroy this temple, i. e. take asunder all its component parts; consequently, it shall cease to be a temple; i. e. the temple shall be annihilated. O, Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; as a people, or body politic.

W. Jesus says, fear him, that after the body is dead, can destroy both soul and body in hell. Here is pain after death.

T. You have not proved the proposition. For if the body were dead, as the text presupposes, then, as a dead body, it could not feel pain in dissolution, even by fire. And if the soul be immaterial and immortal, as you affirm, it could not be destroyed,

nor decomposed. If it be material and mortal, it died with the body, and was unconscious; consequently, there could be no pain after death. Moreover, no honest man would have translated the original word, *gehennan*, by the term, hell; nor would any rational man suppose, an immaterial soul could be destroyed by material fire.

W. The unbeliever shall not see life, his part shall be taken out of the book of life and the holy city.

T. If the unbeliever cannot see life, and you cannot deny but that all have been unbelievers, then we must all go to hell together, and your doctrine is universal damnation. If you read Dan. xii. 1, 2, 7, and Rev. xii. 7; xx. 9, and 21 to 26, you will easily see, that the book of life and the holy city, refer to an ecclesiastical polity, and not to heaven. Paul says, man's unbelief shall not make the faith of God of none effect. God has concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all. Rom. iii. 3, and xi. 32.

W. The terms everlasting and eternal, are applied to the punishment of the wicked, and also to the Deity. Now, if these words mean not endless, we cannot prove that God or the saints shall be eternal, or that heaven shall be eternal.

T. This argument is a mean sophism, which will appear ridiculous when unmasked. Thus, I am tall, the steeple of this church is tall; therefore, I am as tall as the steeple. Napoleon is great, God is great, therefore Napoleon is as great as God. I stand prepared to prove, that the word translated everlasting, eternal, is, by the best authorities, Homer, and the sacred writers, limited to the age of the youngest person in this church.

W. You can probably prove everlasting, to mean only one day.

T. I did not say so—but Jonah limits its extent to three days. And I defy any respectable Greek scholar to say it means endless, without blushing.

W. It is applied to the punishment of the wicked, in connexion with the final judgment. Matt. xxv. 46.

T. If you would look at the adverbs used in the 31st verse, and then read Matt. xvi. 27, 28, Matt. xxiv. 3; unto the 35th. John xxi. 21, 23. 1 Pet. iv. 7, you would be forced to admit the judgment is past 1700 years, and consequently the punishment was temporal.

W. The sin against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven in this world, nor in that which is to come.

T. Sir, you preach, and your disciples assert, that Jesus made a full atonement, oblation, and sacrifice, for the sins of the whole world. If Jesus paid the debt, how could it be forgiven? According to orthodoxy, God forgives no sin, however small. Moreover, if a man commit murder, and be put to death for it, shall any pretend that the man was forgiven?

W. Do you admit there is any sin? Let this be decided.

T. I know not what you call sin; pray explain Acts ii. 23, and iv. 28. How could the Jews crucify Jesus with wicked hands, when delivered by the determinate counsel of God?

W. God delivered him for our offences, or offered him for a Saviour, and the Jews put him to death.

T. Then the Jews did much more to save the world than God, for he only offered Jesus to be a Saviour, and the Jews, by killing him, made him a Saviour; this is the best account I ever heard of them.

W. We believe the Jews did not put Jesus to death. The Lord made him an offering, and his wrath lay heavy on him, and occasioned the death of Christ.

T. I hear something more horrible, than I have ever before heard fall from the lips of man, viz. that the wrath of God killed Jesus, whom, with an audible voice from heaven, he had declared to be his well beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased.

W. Then the Father might deliver Christ, and the Jews, as free agents, might put him to death.

T. So then the Father only helped Judas to betray Jesus, and consequently Judas was a co-worker with God. The term agent, cannot apply to man, who is entirely dependent. Pilate and the Jews did only what God's power and wisdom had predetermined to be done. Acts iv. 28. Jesus said to Pilate, "You could have no power against me except it were given you from on high." John xix. 11. See Gen. i. 20. Isa. xlv. 7, and Amos iii. 6.

W. Then you do not believe in original sin, nor total depravity, consequently no change of nature is needed.

T. I know not what you call original sin; you tell me of the devil sinning in heaven, which if true, was before Adam sinned. Then you tell me of Adam's sin being original. You talk of man changing his nature, first to evil, then to good. I believe all such stories to be fanatical and imaginary. Every man has the nature God gave him, and God never will damn one man for another's offence.

W. I do not say he will, Jesus saves men from the sin of Adam and all its consequences.

T. When will Jesus save men from Adam's sin and all its consequences?

W. In the resurrection.

T. You have stated that human depravity and corrupt nature, as well as all actual sin flow from Adam. Now the argument is at an end. You have either committed yourself, or you are as great a Universalist as myself.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—In a former Number of the Herald, there appeared an extract from the New England Galaxy, giving an account of a very extravagant dress, said to be worn by a Mrs. Judson, a Baptist Missionary. In consequence of the publication of this, a committee was appointed by the Boston Baptist Association, to take into consideration the reports which have been circulated on the subject, and to publish the result of their inquiries. The committee have therefore issued a circular, proving to my satisfaction, the falsity of the statements made by the Editor of the Galaxy. This circular I now hand to you with a request for its insertion. Although I am no friend to foreign missions, and especially not to

those who profess great love to souls, and call upon others to give money to aid in the salvation of the heathen, and yet refrain from giving themselves, although in many instances they have greater ability than those on whom they call. Still, I think, a sense of justice to an injured individual, obliges us, when a misstatement has been made, and the truth afterwards comes to our knowledge, to give it as great a circulation as had been given to the falsehood. I have no personal knowledge of Mrs. Judson, but I know many persons of respectability and veracity who have, and they uniformly say, that she is an amiable and a pious woman, and wholly devoted (though I think mistakingly) to what she thinks the eternal interests of the heathen. Now, Sir, I think when there appears to be nothing like fraud, we should put the most charitable constructions on the intentions of our opponents, and give them credit for sincerity at least; and ought certainly to make a distinction between those who are telling how many souls are daily dropping into endless misery for want of dollars and cents, and ministers to preach, and yet remain at home, and give nothing, and those who forsake friends, and home, and suffer the privations consequent on a residence in a foreign land, to carry those tidings, which they consider will, if believed, exalt them to happiness and heaven. Your compliance with the above request will oblige

E. C.

Note—We agree with our correspondent, and cheerfully give publicity to the Circular. We also express, as our opinion, the sentiment, that the press which is prostituted to the promulgation of falsehood, to palm it upon the public for truth, is very unprofitably employed. We shall, at all times, be more ready to correct errors than to commit them.

ED.

CIRCULAR.

Vindication of Mrs. Judson.

The Committee appointed by the Boston Baptist Association, at Salem, Sept. 18th, 1823, to take into consideration the reports which have been circulated concerning the extravagance of Mrs. Judson's dress, and to publish the result of their inquiries, beg leave to make the following statements.

In a news-paper published in this city on the 25th of July last, the following communication appeared, and has been since transcribed into other papers.

[Then follows the statement, which was copied into this Paper, Number 16, p. 126.]

The personal friends of Mrs. Judson read this communication with surprise and sorrow, mingled with feelings of just indignation. They knew that a difference of opinion existed as to the reasonableness and utility of Foreign Missions, but they did not expect, that the character of a female, who was labouring under the pressure of indisposition, would be unnecessarily assailed.

The account of her *visiting dress* was so far from being correct, that those who had been in her society most frequently, concluded, that no one friendly to Missions would give credit to the representation. But in this they have been disappointed.

Persons who never saw Mrs. Judson, and not finding this account contradicted, have supposed it was true. It was a knowledge of this fact which led to the appointment of the aforesaid Committee by the Boston Baptist Association.

Soon after the publication of the above statement, Mr. E. Lincoln waited on the Editor, and requested to be introduced to the lady who was "in habits of familiar intercourse with Mrs. Judson, and to whom application was made for charity in her behalf; and who had informed him, that the *visiting dress* of this *self-denying* female Missionary could not be valued at less than TWELVE HUNDRED DOLLARS." The Editor introduced him to the gentleman who authorized the communication. This gentleman referred him to his Mother, as the lady alluded to in the above named news-paper. Mr. Lincoln therefore called on her, and was surprised to learn, that this lady, "in habits of familiar intercourse with Mrs. Judson," had never seen her; that she had never been applied to for charity in her behalf; and had no personal knowledge respecting any item in the communication. She stated to Mr. Lincoln, that she had received her information from another lady, whom she named. Mr. Lincoln then sought an interview with this person, who it was said had boarded in the same house with Mrs. Judson, and had seen her rich dresses. But she declared to him, that she had never boarded in the same house, and never had seen either Mrs. Judson or her apparel; but had heard the statement from a lady, who had received it from another lady in Bradford; a small town about thirty miles from this city.

The Committee now state, that the articles of dress, of which so much has been said, were not purchased, either with the private property of Mrs. Judson, or with missionary money; but were presented to her by different individuals, as tokens of personal affection and respect. The Cashmere shawl, "valued at \$600," was given to her in England, by the sister of a distinguished friend of missions; and we are assured, from very respectable authority, that it cost twenty-five dollars. "The Leghorn flat, valued at \$150," was purchased in Salem; and from the certain knowledge of two ladies concerned in the purchase, did not exceed in its cost, eight dollars and fifty cents. As to the lace trimming on the gown, stated at \$150, a very intimate friend, at whose house Mrs. Judson stayed, says, "she had not, to my knowledge, one gown that had a particle of lace upon it. If she had, I was ignorant of it, or it was so trifling, that it did not make an impression sufficient to be remembered." We feel authorized to state, from the testimony of other ladies of unquestionable veracity, who visited with Mrs. Judson in different cities, and who saw the apparel in her possession, that this is a just representation.

Concerning what is said of jewelry, which, in order to make up the aforesaid sum of \$1200, is estimated at \$300, we scarcely know how to express ourselves. With the exception of a chain, and a small locket in which was the likeness of one of the

family, and these were given her, it is believed that her jewelry was not worth five dollars.

For the information of those who did not see Mrs. Judson while she was in this country, the Committee would remark, that a majority of them had the pleasure of receiving her into their families as a guest; and the impression left on their minds was, that she had a soul too elevated to be occupied in ornamenting her person. She was in fact distinguished for the plainness and cheapness of her dress. The same individuals met with her frequently in the cities of New-York and Washington; but in no instance did they see any thing in her deportment or apparel, which did not accord with that modesty, simplicity and plainness, which becometh women professing godliness.

Having stated these facts, the Committee deem it unnecessary to offer any comment upon them, but would leave each reader to make his own reflections.

It may be proper to state, that the Committee are in possession of the names of all the parties concerned, but as the mention of them did not seem necessary for the defence of our highly esteemed friend, Mrs. Judson, they are from motives of delicacy suppressed.

Signed in behalf and by order of the Boston Baptist Association,

THOMAS BALDWIN,
LUCIUS BOLLES,
DANIEL SHARP,
GEORGE KEELY,
ENSIGN LINCOLN.

Boston Oct. 1, 1823.

From the (Canandaigua) Plain Truth.

SECTARIAN ZEAL.

One Joseph Nelson has been delivered of a speech at the anniversary of the Evangelical Tract Society. From a monstrous mass of rant and fustian, I select the following. * * "Only consider the thousands of individuals who are employed in composing tracts, writing sermons, and travelling from place to place in quest of positions to erect their MISSIONARY STANDARDS! Reflect for a moment upon the MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, which are under constant contributions, for the support of these benevolent institutions—the millions of hands, and pockets, which have been employed in collections and contributions, and the millions of millions of motives and trains of thought which have actuated the donors and contributors, &c. &c. Who can calculate? Can Gabriel himself tell what is to be the glorious result of such stupendous enterprise?"

I think Gabriel cannot—for the instigator of this enterprise is an angel of a different stamp. This rantipole religionist continues—"And what are the features and privileges of the millennial church? Let us look around and see on what banners they are displayed. On the *Arminian*, who would rob God of a part of his glory, to share it with the creature? On *all around* [but us!] who would tare [tear?] from his prerogative as King of nations? On *our own banners*, alone [Scotch Presbyterian] can we behold Messiah with this inscription on his

vesture and on his thigh: King of kings and Lord of lords. * * Our tracts have been rapidly multiplying. We will scatter them like drops of dew on the blades of grass," &c. This is a specimen of orthodox oratory and liberality. What are Mr. Nelson's friends about that they do not place him in a mad-house?

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD. THE GOOD SAMARITAN.

LUKE X. 30-37.

See the poor helpless sinner laying
Covered with wounds which sin has made,
On the road-side hear him praying,
Hear him call aloud for aid:
"O!" he cries, "have pity on me;
Do not my wretched case deride,
Do not turn your footsteps from me,
Pass not on the other side."

A certain priest advances near him,
Talks of election and decrees,
The sinner turns an ear to hear him,
But finds no help in words like these;
"If you," says he, "are not elected,
You never can with God abide,
I hope that you are not rejected"—
He passes on the other side.

Another hears his awful groanings,
And tells him if he does his part,
Christ will soothe his grief and moanings
And change his hardened stony heart:
"O," says the sinner, "I can never
Believe myself; in vain I've tried;"
"Well then you will be damn'd for ever,"
He passes on the other side.

A beauteous form at length approaches,
And with compassion views his case,
He does not frown nor vent reproaches,
For love is beaming in his face.
He does not ask why grief and anguish
In the wretches breast reside,
Nor does he leave him there to languish,
Or pass by on the other side.

He pours in oil and wine, and bindeth
Up his wounds, though deep and sore,
And a habitation findeth,
Where he shall live for evermore.
Sinner, though full of grief and pain,
In thy good neighbour's word confide,
Jesus, the GOOD SAMARITAN,
Will not pass on the other side. E. S. G.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on Friday Evenings at seven o'clock. The object of this society is one of universal interest. All religious denominations therefore, are invited to attend.

AGENTS FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Capt. J. C. Churchill, Portland, (Me.) Theodosius Parsons, Esq. Holmes Hole, (Mass.) Messrs. Noah S. Bailey, Norwalk, (Conn.) Richard H. Woods, White Plains; Ralph Malbone, Brooklyn; Benjamin Wright, Jamaica; Ashbel Stoddard, Hudson; William R. Gregory, Ithaca; Stephen Van Schaack, Albany, (N. Y.) Henry Whyte, Petersburg, (Vir.) Timothy Bigelow, Palmyra, Portage Co. David Loring, Cincinnati; Horace Burroughs, Boardman, Trumbull Co. (Ohio.) Gershom D. Miller, Rahway; Williams Woolley, Morristown, (New-Jersey.)

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1823.

NO. 24.

On the Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the Study of the Scriptures.

BY BISHOP HARE.

(Concluded from page 131.)

After all that has been said in this long letter, I am persuaded that many readers will still think what is here advanced a strange paradox; or perhaps be scandalized at it, as a very wicked one; and will on no terms allow, that clergymen should lay aside what ought to be their chief study. And to be ingenuous, I will confess I am entirely of the same mind. I am as unwilling as they can be, to admit the conclusion, that the study of the Scriptures should be deserted; and yet cannot deny, but, humanly speaking, this must be the consequence from these premises. If, therefore, we will not allow the conclusion, we must show the premises to be untrue, and that this study will not be attended with so much danger. But this we in vain attempt, if we do not our parts at least, that these may not be the consequences. For, as long as they are, the study of the Scriptures will certainly continue to be neglected, as it now is; and all men, who contribute to these consequences in any degree, do so far discourage the study of the Scriptures, whatever they pretend.

In truth, there is nothing more absurd, than to say the glorious things we do daily of the Scriptures, and, at the same time, make the study of them, to men of sincere and honest minds, so extremely hazardous and inconvenient. If, then, we would not be guilty of discouraging a study which we acknowledge to be the great duty of the clergy, as we are Christians; if we would be true to the fundamental principles of the reformation, as protestants, that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith; let us use our best endeavours to remove the great obstacles that lie against the study of them; let us do what we can, that learned men may have full liberty to study the Scriptures freely and impartially; good encouragement given them to go through the labour and difficulties of such a study, not slightly and superficially, but with such application and diligence as the nature of the thing requires; and have leave to speak their sense with all manner of safety; that their opinions may be examined fairly, and with temper; that their names be not unjustly loaded with calumny and slander; that their words and actions may be interpreted with the same candor, as is shown to those that differ from them; that if what they advance be right, it may be received; if wrong, their errors may be refuted, as the mistakes of learned men on other subjects; if doubtful, and the Scriptures say so little, or speak so obscure-

ly, that nothing can certainly be decided either way, that then nobody may be obliged to take either side as necessary; that, whether their notions be right or wrong, their persons may, in all events, be safe, and their maintenance not affected by it; that, as long as they live virtuously, and write with all due modesty and good manners, and advance nothing that breaks in upon morality and government, they may be treated in all respects as those are, or ought to be, who employ themselves in any other part of useful learning.

I must add, let them be ever so much in the wrong, I can apprehend no danger from it to the church; or that the errors of a few men can have considerable influence in opposition to a great body of a vigilant and learned clergy, who will be always able and ready to defend the received notions, if they can be defended; and if they cannot, it must be allowed they ought not. But, if some inconveniences would arise from the liberty I contend for, they are nothing in comparison of those that must follow from the want of it.

Till there is such a liberty allowed to clergymen, till there is such a security for their reputations, fortunes, and persons, I fear I must add, till so difficult a study meets with proportionable encouragement, it is impossible a sincere, impartial, and laborious application to it should generally prevail; and till it does, it is as impossible the Scriptures should be well understood; and till they are, they are a rule of faith in name only. For it is not the words of Scripture, but the sense, which is the rule; and so far as that is not understood, so far the Scriptures are not our rule, whatever we pretend; but the sense that men have put on them; men fallible as ourselves, and who were by no means so well furnished, as the learned at present are, with the proper helps to find out the true meaning of Scripture. And while we take the sense of the Scriptures in this manner upon consent, and see not with our own eyes, we insensibly relapse into the principles of popery, and give up the only ground on which we can justify our separation from the church of Rome. It was a right to study and judge of the Scriptures for themselves, that our first reformers asserted with so good effect; and their successors can defend their adherence to them, on no other principle.

If, then, we are concerned for the study of the Scriptures, farther than in words; if we in earnest think them the only rule of faith, let us act as if we thought so; let us heartily encourage a free and impartial study of them; let us lay aside that malignant, arbitrary, persecuting, popish spirit; let us

put no fetters on men's understandings, nor any other bounds to their inquiries, but what God and truth have set. Let us, if we would not give up the protestant principle, that the Scriptures are plain and clear in the necessary articles, declare nothing to be necessary, but what is clearly revealed in them.

Then may we hope to see the study of these divine books, so happily cultivated by the united labours of the learned, when under no discouragements, that all may, in the main, agree in the true meaning of them. Places that can be understood, they will agree to understand alike, such at least as are of consequence to the faith. And for such as are too obscure to be cleared up with any certainty, those likewise they will agree about, and unanimously confess they are such: no article of faith can be grounded upon, or proved from. Next to the understanding a text of Scripture, is to know it cannot be certainly understood. When the clear and dark parts of Scripture are thus distinguished, an unity may then reasonably be hoped for among protestants in necessary points, and a difference of opinion, in such as are not necessary, can have no manner of ill consequence, nor any way disturb the peace of the church; since there will then be nothing left in its doctrines to inflame men's passions, or feed their corrupt interests, when we are all agreed about what is essential to religion; and what is not essential is looked on as indifferent, so that a man may take one side, or the other, or neither, or may change, as he sees reason, without offence.

Upon the whole, a free and impartial study of the Scriptures either ought to be encouraged, or it ought not. There is no medium; and therefore those who are against one side, which ever it be, are necessarily the espousers of the other. Those who think it ought not to be encouraged, will, I hope, think it no injury to be thought to defend their opinion upon such reasons as have been here brought for it, till they give better. On the other hand, those who think these reasons inconclusive, and cannot find better, will find themselves obliged to confess, that such a study ought to be encouraged; and consequently must take care how they are accessory to such practices, as in their natural consequence cannot but tend to its discouragement; lest they come into the condemnation of those who love darkness rather than light; there is, in this case, no other medium between encouraging and discouraging, but what there is between light and darkness. Every degree of darkness is a want of so much light; and all want of light is a certain degree of darkness. To refuse then a greater degree of light, where it can be had, is, in truth, to prefer darkness; which, in my humble opinion, can never be reasonable or excusable. Those, who are of another mind, plainly distrust themselves or their cause. Which if it can bear the light, why should it not be shown in it? But, if it cannot, it is not the cause of God, or of the Son of God; for God is light, and in him is no darkness; and the Son of God is the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

From the (Philadelphia) Reformer.

MISSIONARIES AMONG THE INDIANS.

The statements contained in the following communication, are from a source on which we can place the fullest dependence. Several persons in this city are well acquainted with the writer. He resides, moreover, in the same county where the Indian tribes, referred to in this communication, are located, and has been apprized of the necessity of having the facts well authenticated.

Messrs. Editors—Your exposure of the Serampore Missionaries, having tended much to enlighten the public in relation to those men, I am induced to present the following statement of facts respecting Missionaries at home; leaving your readers to make their own comments.

I shall speak of the *New-Stockbridge, Brothertown, and Oneida tribes of Indians*, all located in the county of Oneida, state of New-York.

New-Stockbridge Indians. The first Missionary to the New-Stockbridges, was John Sargeant, who settled among them in 1734. He was succeeded in 1751, by the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, who having had a misunderstanding with his congregation at Northampton, (Mass.) and being unable to effect a reconciliation, was called to preach *peace* to the Indians, until he had a *greater call*, and was made president of the college in New Jersey. A Mr. West, who resigned soon after, succeeded Mr. Edwards, and then the place was supplied by John Sargeant, the present incumbent, and descendant of the first Sargeant.

Thus you will perceive, there has been a regular supply of Missionaries to these Indians for *ninety* years! But notwithstanding their efforts, I make the assertion without the fear of contradiction, that with the exception of two or three families, and those not under the Missionary influence, there is not a more dissolute, vagabond race on the continent, than the New-Stockbridge Indians. I have John Sargeant's own words, that excepting a female, of whom I shall speak hereafter, there is not a person in the tribe but will get drunk.

This John Sargeant has received from the society in Boston, for "Propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others, in North America," \$210 per annum; and from the society at Edinburgh, (Scotland) 'For propagating Christian Knowledge,' £50 sterling per annum; making in the whole, \$432, 22 cents; which, with other charges, during his mission of about fifty years, will amount to near \$30,000. To this add the expenses of his predecessors, and I presume the whole will not fall short of \$50,000. This *disinterested* Missionary, obtained from the Indians a gift of six hundred and forty acres of their best land, worth at this moment, were it uncultivated, \$18 per acre. He and his son, by their intrigues, contrived, moreover, to get possession of two hundred and fifty acres more, a few years since, at \$2 per acre, worth, at the time, \$18, instead of \$2; and I cannot find that it ever was paid for at any price. In this two hundred and fifty acre lot, was an *apple orchard* of nearly one hundred acres, belonging to the tribe, the only orchard

they had, and which they never intended he should have; but by his ingenuity he succeeded in getting it.

I have conversed with every individual (four) of the present, and two of the former superintendents, for the Indians, and the Indians' present and former attorneys, all appointed by the state, and all respectable leading members of society, resident within a few miles of the tribe, and it is their *unanimous* opinion, that for the last twenty years, the labours of the Missionaries have been of *no service*, and for the last ten years, much worse than useless.

By his flattering accounts, J. Sargeant has duped the Missionary Societies to continue his pay, notwithstanding the report of Drs. Morse and Belknap, who visited the Indians in 1796; in which report, speaking of the Oneidas, they say—"They found nothing of Christianity but the name. At the last communion only one attended, and of the men, there were only three or four of a sober character."

The missionary family have contrived to handle the Indian moneys, always taking good care to be well paid for the least and every service they perform; and, although often solicited by the Indians, they have never taken the pains to give satisfactory explanations of the disposal of those moneys. It can be said with truth, that the tribe are but little less than the slaves of that family.

My communication would be tediously long, were I to enter into a detail of the chicanery of the Sargeants. The present John Sargeant lived among these New-Stockbridge Indians forty-four years, previous to their ever having made a blanket. He not only neglected to instruct them in the useful arts, but used every argument to dissuade them from receiving such instruction from others. A female of the society of Friends, went and resided among them, for the purpose of instructing them in household manufactures; J. Sargeant, with the sagacity of a Jesuit, saw that her success would be his downfall, and actually proposed to hire her to move away. He resides on a high hill, about two miles from the principal settlement of the Indians, and visits them about once a week, which, he has said, he does from the fear that some other missionary would be sent to take his place. His congregation consists of about twenty members, such as they are. During the last session of the state legislature, his family made another attempt to get a tract of the Indian lands; but owing to the intelligence and influence of one of the tribe, the female mentioned in the former part of this communication, who was educated by the Society of Friends near Philadelphia, their plans were frustrated, and we begin to hope, that with the decline of the missionary mania, this curse upon that tribe will be removed.

In 1819, the superintendents in their report to the governor of this state, respecting the Indians, say:

"Experience has taught us, by long having lived in their neighbourhood, that examples of piety, industry, and economy, are more wanted among them than preaching. And we are happy in being able to state, that the condition of the Brothertown Indians in particular, for a few years past, has grad-

ually become better, while the Stockbridges has grown worse. And it is gratifying to us, that a considerable number have, during the past year, among the Brothertowns, become religiously disposed under the influence of some of their own tribe."

The Brothertowns have never had a missionary. The Society of Friends settled an exemplary family among them, to civilize and instruct them in agriculture, and household manufactures. The beneficial effects are very apparent; many of their farms are well managed, they are well clothed, and in most respects are respectable farmers. They have two preachers of their own tribe, and soberly attend to their religious duties. Their condition is infinitely superior to either the Stockbridges or Oneidas.

Oneida Indians. The first missionary among them, was Samuel Kirkland, from Norwich, Connecticut, in 1764; he was patronised by the Edinburgh Society and Harvard College in conjunction. He obtained a donation from the Indians of more than two thousand five hundred acres of their best lands, and inferior to none in the state. Such was his conduct, and so unfavourable the report of Drs. Morse and Belknap, that the Scotch Society dismissed him from their service, after having squandered their money upon him for about twenty-five years. He is deceased, and I wish not to disturb his ashes, nor uselessly hurt the feelings of his descendants. After his death, in 1808, the Northern Missionary Society sent William Jenkins to supply the vacancy. Jenkins' conduct was unsatisfactory to the Indians; they remonstrated against him, and he was removed in 1816, not having succeeded in getting hold of any of their lands. Eleazer Williams, a *half blood* Iroquois, who was very busy in remonstrating against Jenkins, was sent by Bishop Hobart, of the Protestant Episcopal church, as his successor. This Williams first promised fair, but like other hirelings, his own pecuniary interests got the ascendancy, and by management and intrigue he got 1,500 dollars worth of their lands. All parties, Pagan and Christian, united against him, in an animated and well written remonstrance to the Bishop, dated 12th Nov. 1821, and published in *Plain Truth*, and in No. 39 of the *Reformer*; to which, for a true picture of this Missionary, I wish to refer the reader.

I intended to have given a detail of the management and morals of the Missionaries; but I forbear the disgusting tale.

Close observations, made by visitors and others, lead to the unanimous conclusion, that those natives, whom the Missionaries pretend to have Christianized, are more dissolute, debauched, and corrupt, in every sense of these words, than those they are pleased to term Pagans: thus *making those whom they proselyte, two-fold more the children of hell than before.* The Oneidas were a powerful tribe, and it would seem that the greatest effect produced by our bigoted Missionaries, has been to create a *Christian* and a *Pagan party*, a division, the source of more unhappiness and bitterness among them, than all the other causes combined, not excepting the curse of intoxication. The country bordering

on the Indian Reserves is very fertile—as handsomely cultivated as any of the interior of this state, and also inhabited by as intelligent a population; to every one of whom, who knows any thing of this subject, I appeal for a confirmation of what I have written.

The contrast, on comparing the Brothertowns, *without a missionary*, with the Stockbridges, and Oneidas *with their missionaries*, is as glaring in favour of the former, as the meridian sun when contrasted with the mantle of night.

It is becoming an almost universal belief in these parts, that every missionary who goes among the Indians, goes with the speculating motive of bettering his condition; and the first step which he generally takes, is to gain a party to act for him, in opposition to the others; thus at once sowing the seeds of religious hate, (the most rancorous of all hate) and strife and discord prevail, where unity, love, and peace, dwelt before.

Although the picture of missionaries which has here been presented, may possess a more than ordinary sable hue, I am induced to think, if all hireling missionaries and priests were stripped of their masks, they would appear in a very disparaging light. And that notwithstanding their flaming accounts of evangelizing the heathen, and building up the kingdom of Christ, the benefit of their labours, if properly estimated, would, to say the least, award them no pay.

To such as feel interested in the examination of the missionary delusion, I would recommend the perusal of "Brown's History of Missions," so as to compare the glowing prospects constantly held up to the patrons of their schemes, with the final results which time has but too faithfully exhibited.

AN ONEIDA COUNTY OBSERVER.

From the (Hartford) Religious Inquirer.

GENERAL CONVENTION.

The General Convention of Universalists, convened in CLINTON, township of Paris, (N. Y.) on the 17th and 18th Sept. The council was formed by choosing Br. A. Kneeland, Moderator.—Brs. R. Carrique, and N. Stacy, Clerks. There were THIRTY-FOUR Ministers present, and a numerous delegation from the various societies. Two new societies were received into fellowship, and an Association recently formed in the western part of Massachusetts, called the "FRANKLIN ASSOCIATION." Three young brethren of promising talents, received the approbation of the Convention to labour in the vineyard of the Gospel, and were acknowledged as brethren, possessing precious faith, and worthy of confidence as Ministers of the grace of God: and one, Br. King, of Hudson, was ordained, as an evangelist to bear the glad tidings of everlasting life to the ransomed of the Lord, according to the divine purposes of Him, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

Seven discourses were delivered on the occasion, by Brs. C. G. Parsons, R. Carrique, P. Morse, J.

Flagler, A. Kneeland, H. Ballou, and P. Dean. The audience was numerous, being estimated at more than THREE THOUSAND. The services were rendered solemn, and divinely animating, by a most excellent choir of singers, led by Mr. Sanger, who displayed much judgment, taste and devotional feeling in the selection of the tunes used on the occasion, which were performed in a style rarely excelled, and very seldom equalled.

The committees appointed the last year to visit the several associations in fellowship with the Convention, made the most pleasing reports of the progress of the TRUTH in the several sections of our happy country, in which they are located. The relations of the prosperity of ZION in the East and the West, were such as evinced the wonder-working power of the spirit of God, in slaying the enmity, removing the prejudices, opening the eyes of the blind, and delivering the captive who had long been bound with the galling chains of bigotry, and bowed down by the unhallowed power of ecclesiastical tyranny. Thousands and tens of thousands are rejoicing in the goodness of Almighty God, and their numbers are daily increasing; the servants of the Lord had great cause for congratulation and joy, and with the most pleasing sensations could adopt the poetic expressions of a brother.

In thy wide fields and vineyards, Lord,
We've toil'd and wrought with watchful care;
The wheat doth flourish by the word,
And love consumes the choking tare.

The reapers cry, Thy fields are white,
And ready to be gather'd in;
The lab'rer shouts, with sweet delight,
This is the day to finish sin.

The intelligence, received from different parts, extending far and wide over this portion of God's heritage, evinced to us that the influence of the spirit of God was not confined to a particular section of town, neither was his power to be compared to a CLOUD, which for a while hangs suspended over one town and then passes to another, in one place sprinkling a few drops of rain, and in another passing over without yielding one reviving drop, thus exciting expectations, and cruelly disappointing all hopes; but as the dew which falls on the tender herb in the still silence of night refreshing the thirsty plant, so is the operation of the spirit of God, as the still small voice whispering peace to the mind, and without noise or tumult, without the threatening aspect of a destructive storm, or of a dense cloud surcharged with electric fluid ready to hurl the thunder bolt at the devoted head of some unhappy being groping in darkness, it wins the heart to God by moulding it into the divine image, which is love; chases away the darkness that obscured the mental vision; and brings man to the knowledge of that truth which maketh free.

We behold the advancement of the doctrine of God's universal love as Moses described it, when he said—"My doctrine shall drop as the rain: my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass."—On this heavenly doctrine must the cele-

brated poet, Watts, have had his eye, when he wrote the following inimitable lines.

As showers on meadows newly mown,
Jesus shall send his blessings down;
Crowned with whose life-infusing drops,
Earth shall renew her blissful crops.

Lands, that beneath a burning sky,
Have long been desolate and dry,
Th' effusions of his love shall share
And sudden greens and herbage wear.

The dews and rains, in all their store,
Drenching the pastures o'er and o'er,
Are not so copious as that grace
Which sanctifies and saves our race.

While then others rejoice when they behold a small cloud, passing slowly along, resting for a short time on this place or that, and from whence falls only here and there a drop of water to refresh the thirsty earth, or revive the drooping dying plant, what great cause of rejoicing is presented to the Universalist, when he beholds the copious showers of divine grace extending from Maine to Georgia, and from the shores of the Atlantic moving over the mountains of the west co-extensive with civilization, and cultivation of the soil! We will then say to our brethren, Rejoice in the Lord and be exceeding glad, great is His goodness, and divinely glorious His power in the salvation of man; the time is come spoken of by the Prophet; the mandate hath gone forth; the word is to Zion, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of their habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited." Once more we say, great is our cause for rejoicing, and adopt the language of the poet,

Let Zion and her sons rejoice;
Behold the promised hour;
Her God hath heard her mourning voice,
And will exalt his power.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—Sir, by giving an *exposition* of the following Articles of Faith, and showing the contradictions contained in them, you will much oblige a subscriber.

WILLIAM W. SMITH.

Parkman, July 20, 1823.

CONFESSION OF FAITH,

And Articles of Practice, adopted May 1, 1822, by the Presbyteries of Grand River and Portage Counties, Ohio.

"Art. I. You believe there is one God, the creator, the preserver, and governor of the universe; that he is self-existent, independent, unchangeable, infinite in mercy, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.

"Art. II. You believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, were given by inspiration of God; that they contain a complete and harmonious system of divine truth; and are the only perfect rule of religious faith and practice.

"Art. III. You believe that there are *three persons* in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the

Holy Ghost; that these *three* are in essence *one*, and in all divine perfections *equal*.

"Art. IV. You believe that God governs all things according to his eternal and infinitely wise purpose, so as to render them conducive to his own glory, and the greatest good of the universe, and in perfect consistency with his hatred of sin, the liberty of man, and the importance of the use of means.

"Art. V. You believe that God at first created man in his own moral image, consisting in righteousness and true holiness; that he fell from that holy and happy state, by sinning against God, and that since the fall of Adam, all human kind come into the world with a *disposition entirely sinful*.

"Art. VI. You believe that in reference to the fall of man, God did from all eternity appoint the Lord Jesus Christ, his only and well-beloved Son, Mediator, who assumed our nature and made atonement for sin; that God can now consistently exercise mercy towards sinners, and that he will pardon all those who repent and believe the gospel.

"Art. VII. You believe that as *all* men in their *natural* state reject Christ, God did from all eternity choose *some* of the human race to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth; and all those whom he hath *chosen* he will *renew* and sanctify in *this life*, and keep them by his power through faith unto salvation; and that all those whom he *has not thus elected*, are left to pursue *their own* chosen way, and suffer punishment due to their sins.

Art. VIII. You believe that Christians are *justified freely* by grace, through faith, and that although they are thus freely justified, still the law of God as a rule of duty remains in full force, and that all men are under obligations perfectly to obey it.

"Art. IX. You believe that *personal holiness* is the certain effect of the renewing operations of the Holy Spirit, and affords to believers the *only scriptural evidence* of their justification, and title to the heavenly inheritance; that you have been thus renewed, and that you exercise faith in Christ.

"Art. X. You believe that men are free and voluntary in all their conduct; that the requirements of God are perfectly reasonable, and that sinners are inexcusable for impenitence and unbelief.

"Art. XI. You believe that the visible Church of Christ consists of visible saints, who publicly profess their faith in him, and that baptized children so belong to the church as to be under its care and instruction.

"Art. XII. You believe in the *Divine appointment of the Christian Sabbath*, and of the sacraments of the New Testament, baptism and the Lord's supper, which all are under obligation in the exercise of faith to observe, and that it is the duty of parents to dedicate their children to God in baptism, and train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

"Art. XIII. You believe that the *soul is immortal*, and that at the last day Christ will raise the dead, and judge the world in righteousness; that all who *die impenitent* will go away into *endless punishment*.

ishment, and the righteous be received to heaven to enjoy eternal felicity."

REMARKS.

Our correspondent might, with the same propriety, have requested us to dissolve an indissoluble substance, as to ask us to "give an *exposition*" of the above Articles of Faith. We may point out some of their contradictions and absurdities, which we purpose to do, but to expound them, and give a consistent and harmonious exposition, would require more sagacity than ever fell to the lot of any mortal.

Of the *first* article, we shall only remark, that it cannot be true that God is "the *preserver* of the universe," and "*infinite in mercy, truth,*" &c. if God shall *destroy* the greatest or any part of the universe, and make the subjects of his destruction *infinitely miserable*; neither can He be infinite in *truth*, if His promise that *all* shall be blessed in Christ, fails; and the greater or any part, are cursed endlessly *out of Christ*.

The *second* article is a perfect satire on their whole production. For if the Scriptures are a "*complete and harmonious system of Divine Truth, and the only perfect rule of faith,*" &c. why introduce their jargon in the guise of articles of faith? Is this mass of absurdity, (when considered in the whole,) which is a system of self-styled holy and reverend *men*, preferable to the Divine system? If the Divine system is a *perfect rule*, and the *only* one, what must that be, which comes from another source? Ans. It must be an imperfect and devilish system! There is only the wisdom from above, which "is pure, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy," &c. "and without partiality," &c. and the wisdom from "beneath," which is impure, wrathful, destitute of mercy, and partial to a few.

The third article is nothing more nor less than Polytheism. *Three persons are three objects* of worship; and the worship of *three* distinct persons or objects, is as much idolatry as the worship of three thousand. The Scriptures, which these Presbyterians acknowledge to be "a perfect rule of faith," &c. say not a word of three persons.

Article fourth is a specimen of finesse. God's purpose is wise and immutable. It has for an object, the greatest good of the universe, &c. What say the Scriptures, the "*only perfect rule of faith*?" Ans. That God's purpose is to gather *all* in Christ. (See Ephes. i.) These Presbyterians show their consistency in article seven; where they consider the eternal purpose of God to be the salvation of *some* of the human race. *A part of the universe!*

Article fifth is Presbyterianism. How will it agree with the "*only perfect rule of faith*?" Namely: "All mankind come into the world with a *disposition entirely sinful*." The "*only perfect rule*" says, "Suffer little children [who are "*entirely sinful*"] to come unto me," &c. "for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

Article sixth declares, that, (in consequence of Christ's atonement,) "God can now *consistently* exercise mercy towards sinners." Will God act consistently? Article seventh says, No! "All those whom he has not elected, are left," &c. It is proper

to tell these Presbyterians, that if any course is consistent (that is, right, fit, and proper,) a contrary course is inconsistent. But they profess to believe God will pardon all who *repent*. That is, we suppose, repent of the "*disposition entirely sinful*" that God gave them. The "*perfect rule*" says, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord." Do the Presbyterians believe this? No!

Article seventh declares, that "men in their *natural state* reject Christ." This *natural state*, which causes them to reject Christ, is the state God placed them in. For it would be madly absurd for any one to say, that the infant was accessory to his origin and qualities. Then the man is damned endlessly for being in the state he was born in. Nero, Caligula, ye whose cruelties stain the page of history, lift up your heads and no longer blush for your enormities. Your cruelties were mercies compared to the acts of this abominable tyrant whom these misguided men profess to worship! 'Tis rank hypocrisy to tell of sinners being damned for pursuing "*their own chosen way,*" when it is previously asserted that they have no choice, but are sent into being with "*a disposition entirely sinful*." And they "suffer the punishment due to *their sins*." *Their sins!* If this hypothesis be true, they have no sin. Heaven is not more sinless than all the race of Adam. The maker of man is the only sinner, and man the only sufferer! You might as well assign for the reason of man's damnation, the contour of his face, or the colour of his complexion.

Article eighth is at war with "the only perfect rule." See Rom. iii. 23, 24. "For *all* have sinned," &c. "being justified freely by his grace through the *redemption that is in Christ Jesus*." Not through the *faith* or works of man. These blind guides make a *perfect* compliance with the requisitions of the law indispensable. Also, sinners must be renewed in *this life*. Have they Scripture for this? No! For that declares, "By the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight!"

Article ninth declares "*personal holiness*" [in this life,] to be "the only *Scriptural* evidence of their *justification*," &c. This is certainly a clumsy orthodox bull! Pray, is "*personal holiness*" a *Scriptural* evidence? Astonishing absurdity! And this blundering conclusion from a whole Presbytery!!!!!! Now we will show you another besides the "*only Scriptural evidence*." Look at this evidence of justification. Rom. v. 8, 9, 10. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet *sinners* Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Also, v. 25. "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Also, 2 Cor. v. 19. "God was in Christ, reconciling the *world* [not the *elect*,] unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Wonderful to relate, the good Presbyterians say, they *believe* they have been "thus renewed." That is, are "*personally holy*." And a little more proof

too, of their goodness, They keep the law of God perfectly! We seriously question, whether so much as one of the members of these churches, not excepting the pious parsons themselves, believe this!

Article tenth is mad with absurdity. First. "Men are free," &c. Free to do what? Ans. To follow the bent of "a disposition which is *entirely* sinful." Second. "The requirements of God are perfectly reasonable." What does God require? Ans. A perfect compliance with his *holy* law. And it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that men born with "dispositions *entirely* sinful," can become, of themselves, with the assistance of their excellent disposition, *perfectly holy*! Third. "Sinners are *inexcusable* for impenitence," &c. This, we presume, is proved to be perfectly reasonable, when it is declared that only *some* are assisted, and the non-elect left to pursue the teachings of the "disposition which is *entirely* sinful." And the elect, themselves, are operated on by the irresistible power of the spirit of God. Then, the non-elect are damned, for not being as holy of themselves, as the elect are with God's assistance!

The eleventh article is of ordinary import, and we pass it over.

Article twelfth declares the *first* day of the week to be the Sabbath, by *Divine* appointment. That is, they say they believe so. "The only perfect rule" says, "The *seventh* day," &c. They will train their children in the nurture of the Lord," &c. Query. Will teaching them their articles of faith do this?

Of article thirteenth, and last, we remark—If the soul is *immortal*, it cannot die. That now is the day of judgment. (See Rev. xiv. 6, 7.) The judgment commenced with the preaching of the gospel at the destruction of Jerusalem. And when man shall be raised from the dead, (1 Cor. xv.) he shall be raised *immortal*, incorruptible, and glorious. Then the triumphant song will be sung; and the vagaries of fanatics be for ever lost in oblivion.

We have no hesitation in asserting, as our opinion, that Deism is altogether preferable to the doctrine contained in the above articles of faith. It is more reasonable—more honourable to the character of God: and it is more consoling to the mind of man. Indeed, it would be difficult to name a worse ism, than *Calvinistic* Presbyterianism! Take the following from Voltaire, a Deist, and compare it with the Presbyterian's Creed, and both with reason and Scripture.

"The adoration of God with the heart and the lips, and the conscientious discharge of our duties to each other, would make all mankind brethren, and the universe a temple. Dogmas are the invention of fanatics and knaves. Morality is an emanation of God. The doctrine of purgatory has cost a hundred thousand lives; but this simple profession of faith, *I love God, and ought to do good to my fellow creatures*, has never produced a single quarrel from the foundations of the world. Come, then, my rational Unitarian, my dear Quaker, my good Baptist, my gloomy Presbyterian, my careless Episcopalian, come ye Methodists and Pietists, come even

ye Papists, and let us all prostrate ourselves before the Supreme Being, and thank him for giving us poultry, and venison, and bread, for our nourishment, reason to know him, and a heart to adore; and, after having thus said grace, let us sup together in the cheerful benevolence of good fellowship."

From the *Gospel Palladium*.
MOTHER OF GOD.

An emigrant priest taught the French language to several young persons, whom he attended at their parent's houses. Two of my children were under his tuition; one of them a daughter, about fifteen. With her, after her exercise was over, he would often sit and chat an hour. Religion was a frequent topic with them, as Monsieur was a fervid Catholic, and my daughter a thorough paced Unitarian: I was often amused with their conversation, even when I had no part in it. The gentleman often had occasion to mention Mary, the mother of Jesus, but he never called her by that scripture title; on the contrary, he always called her the *holy Virgin Mary, Mother of my God*.

One morning, as I sat writing in a distant part of the room, I heard the following conversation between them: "You say, Mr. C. that the Virgin Mary is the mother of your god." "Yes, Mademoiselle, she be so." "By your God, I suppose you mean Jesus Christ, who you say, is God Almighty." "Yes, Mademoiselle, Jesus Christ be God Almighty." "Pray, Sir, who is the Virgin Mary's mother?" "St. Ann, Mademoiselle, St. Ann be the Virgin Mary's mother." "Then Sir, I suppose, that St. Ann is God Almighty's grand-mother." The poor priest blushed, paused, and was evidently confused; he recovered himself, and replied. "As *man*, Mademoiselle, St. Ann be the grand-mother of Jesus Christ." "If so, sir, then I suppose that St. Mary is the mother only of the *man* Christ Jesus, and not the mother of God, otherwise St. Ann *must* be God Almighty's grand-mother." Another pause of visible confusion followed. At last the gentleman exclaimed, "O, Mademoiselle, my good mother, the holy Catholic church, do say that the holy Virgin Mary be the mother of God; but she does not allow us to say, that St. Ann be the grand-mother of God." "Sir, my father has taught me, that no church has authority to teach what is not taught in the Scriptures." "Ah, Mademoiselle, your father be one very good man, I do love him very much, but he be in very great dangerous errors. I do pray to the holy mother of my God, that he be convinced of his great errors." "Sir, I have no doubt but that my father is much obliged to you for your charitable prayers, for I have heard him say, that charity always edifies him; but that he expects solid argument for the conviction of his mind." The priest hastily arose, and saying, "Bonjour, Mademoiselle, bonjour," retired.

"I cannot help noticing that truly protestant maxim, that 'the Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of protestants.' This maxim fully imbibed, gave to this intelligent child the advantage over an aged and zealous Catholic priest.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

AN ORTHODOX STORY.

A No. of the "FARMER'S CABINET," a paper published in Amherst, (N. H.) was lately sent us, containing the following :

"*Interesting Facts.*—In a public address at the Meeting of the Maine Missionary Society, it was stated that a pious female instructor had taught her pupils the Lord's Prayer, and that they must pray to Jesus Christ. A little girl was seriously affected with the subject, and being ignorant of the nature of prayer, applied to her mother to instruct her. The mother being also ignorant, had recourse to the instructor for information, and wished to know who *Jesus Christ was*, not recollecting that she had ever heard the name of Jesus Christ until she heard it from the mouth of her daughter. This extreme ignorance was accounted for by the fact, that the woman had been brought up in a family of *Universalists.*"

This story was first published at Portland, (Me.) in the "*Christian Mirror*," of July 11th, by Mr. Rand, the editor of that paper. In the "*Christian Intelligencer*" of July nineteenth, Mr. Streeter made a most urgent demand on the editor of the "*Mirror*," for the authority for his story. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Streeter said, "We hesitate not to adventure our liberty, and all we hold dear in time, that the editor of the *Mirror* cannot prove the story he has related. Let him answer only three questions, viz : *What is the name of the Rev. Trustee who related this interesting fact ? In what town does this mother of a family, of more than savage ignorance, reside ? What is her name ?* If he values his reputation, he will spare no pains to answer these questions." But, notwithstanding the urgency of Mr. Streeter's demand, and the manifest obligation of Mr. Rand to comply with it, Mr. Rand does not yet see fit to inform us *who* told the story at the Missionary meeting ; nor what was the *woman's name*, nor in *what town* she lived !

But it is certainly high time that he either does it, or else recalls his story. He sees that it is already copied into *another* paper, and into how many more we know not. It was published for no other purpose than to prejudice the mind of the people against Universalists : and he who published it, cannot be *informed* that there are many prepared to receive it with exultation, notwithstanding the manifestness of its falsehood or misrepresentation. That it is false, we are as confident as Mr. Streeter ; for it is morally impossible that there is a woman (*of common sense*) brought up in a family of *Universalists*, who does not recollect of ever having heard the name of Jesus Christ.

Will Mr. Rand attend to this affair soon, and answer Mr. Streeter's demand ? Or will he just give us the name of the *Trustee* who told the story in the Missionary Meeting ?

NEWS FROM OHIO.

We have received a letter from our Brother Bigelow, Palmyra, Portage county, (Ohio,) giving very encouraging accounts of the rapid increase of be-

lievers of the great salvation in that state. Societies are multiplying, and preachers of the gospel of *Christ* are much wanted. How different is this state of affairs, from the popular religious world ! Preachers of endless misery, and the creeds of Calvin, Hopkins, and Arminius, are starting up like mushrooms in every corner and section of the orthodox plantations, and can be had by scores. Nay, they multiply somewhat like the locusts of Egypt, and are filling the country. The theological mills are continually turning them out : and they are manufactured to the glutting of the market. Already they have become an article of *exportation*, and are shipped to foreign climes. Preachers of the *Truth*, the Gospel of our salvation, come from another quarter, and are sent on another errand. When they appear, their labour is wanted, and they need no other diploma than the sword of the Spirit.

A TOUCH OF THE TERRIBLE !

Extract of a letter to the Editors, from Providence, Rhode-Island.

"I send you a few eloquent expressions of the Rev. Mr. L.—of this town—which were delivered in a speech to the Female Society. After displaying all his zeal in order to convince his audience that it was their indispensable duty to give their money, he concluded as follows—'And my friends if you leave this house without contributing your mite, you need not think of saving your money thereby, for the Lord will have it some way or another. If you do not give it voluntarily he will *burn your houses,* *destroy your shipping and merchandize,* and blast your hopes for ever.'"

[If any one doubts the authenticity of the above extract, he can be satisfied by the original letter now on file in this office. This letter contains the priest's name, and the writer's name written in full length.] Eds. *Plain Truth.*

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

INVITATION.

With praises unfeigned, and minds uncontroll'd,
Salute we JEHOVAH, our covenant Lord ;
Revering His oath to the fathers of old,
Obeying the precepts reveal'd in His Word.

A pardon is purchas'd ! the prophets proclaim'd,
For thee, helpless sinner, 'twas purchas'd for thee !
Behold ! "It is finish'd !" the Saviour exclaim'd,
While, bleeding and dying, he hung on the tree.

Then speedily open thine eyes to the light ;
No longer remain a sad object of fear ;
For Hell, as it's painted, shall never affright,
Nor Death in eternity ever appear.

High raise your notes to the God of creation,
Ye who from bondage are happily freed—
'Tis Jesus' good pleasure to own the relation
Subsisting 'tween Gentiles and Abraham's seed. C.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on Friday Evenings at seven o'clock. The object of this society is one of universal interest. All religious denominations therefore, are invited to attend.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1823.

NO. 25.

WORKS OF DARKNESS.

At the solicitation of some of our friends in Amenia, we insert the following *thing*, called a sermon. Abstractly considered, it is undeserving any notice. It is now offered the public for the following reasons: Respectable clergymen of the Presbyterian persuasion are fostering this wicked and foolish production, and are circulating it, thereby making themselves accountable for its falsehood and perversions. Therefore, we offer this sermon, (although anonymous) as the production of some of the *Calvinistic* clergymen. It appears the *good* people of Portsmouth (N. H.) have also been interested in the promulgation of this wretched sample of clerical finesse and deception. That it has recently been published at Hartford, (Con.) from the press of *Mr. Gleason* of that city, by a *Mr. Kendrick, a missionary!* And the REV. JOEL OSBORN, of Amenia (N. Y.) is *honourably* employed in the circulation of the work! We have a few questions to ask the *Rev. Joel Osborn*, (and his compeers in this work,) which we hope this Rev. Gentleman will consider with becoming seriousness.

Reverend Sir, do you not *know*, that this sermon, so *called*, was written and published by one or more *Calvinists*? That no person professing the faith of the Salvation of all men, ever saw or heard of this production anterior to its publication? That no teacher of Universal Salvation ever preached the absurdities which this Sermon contains? Do you not also know, that all teachers of Universal Salvation, preach a doctrine disagreeing with most of the positions and assertions contained in this work? And, finally, do you not know, that whenever you offer this wicked production to any person, as a "Sermon preached and published by a Doctor of the Sect," (that is, a preacher of Universal Salvation,) you offer for *truth*, that which your conscience tells you is an *abominable falsehood*? Sir, if the consequences of sinning be, in another mode of existence, what *you* so solemnly assert from the pulpit, what will be *your* punishment for this *voluntary* wickedness?

We confess we are at a loss to conceive the motive of the writer of this Sermon, for introducing, in his section numbered "3," the important truths which no man in his senses can gainsay or contradict. Every honest enlightened man, can lay his hand upon his heart, and with soberness and sincerity say—"How obvious is it, my brethren, that if God is a being of *benevolence* he must *delight in the happiness of his creatures!* And if he delights in their *happiness*, will he ever make any of them *miserable?*" We reply—No! Never! Never! Ne-

ver! We believe suffering will befall the writer, publishers, and reverend distributors of this shameful production. Let them answer the question, whether God makes them suffer, or whether they suffer as a consequence of their *falsehood and deception?*

In the *net* which they have hid, shall *their own feet be taken!*



GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY:

Or the doctrine of Universal Salvation, clearly stated, incontestibly proved, and faithfully applied, in a Sermon, preached and published by a Doctor of the Sect.

"*Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy.*"* LUKE ii. 12.

In looking round on this promiscuous assembly, brought together by the cheering doctrine which I am about to preach, I see many who stand in need of comfort and consolation. Our mode of life, my brethren, exposes us to many evils. Our congregation being generally composed of the looser sort of men, we meet to worship God in circumstances which call for peculiar commiseration and mercy. A praying swearer is surely a real object of compassion; an habitual Sabbath-breaker, or reviler of sacred things, engaged in acts of worship, stands in peculiar need of *grace*; and a Universal preacher, speaking peace to the wicked and soothing the consciences of the guilty, deserves at least *some mercy*. Of all sects, ours needs consolation the most. But to all of you, my hearers, whatever your character and condition, whatever your sentiments and course of life, I come to "bring good tidings of great joy." Every word of my text seems to be applicable to you. You have suffered a great deal from remorse of conscience and fear of punishment; I say unto you, *Fear not*. You never go to hear the gospel preached; behold, I *bring* it to you. You have heard in your lives a great deal of bad news, much that was fitted to awaken and alarm you; I bring you good tidings. You are an unhappy set of people, being often troubled with law-suits, constables, executions and prisons; I speak of great joy; that is, I speak on the only religious subject that can give any joy to persons in your condition. In short, I come to tell you that all men shall be saved. Every sinner, be his character what it may, shall die and go to heaven.

I shall divide my discourse into two parts.

* The wretched authors of this sermon omitted the words, "which shall be to all people," and refer the reader to the wrong verse. (Ed.)

1. I shall prove that all will be saved, of every character and condition; whether they die in a palace, or a state's prison; by natural death, or by the rope; and,

2. I shall shew the advantages of this doctrine.

I. Then I am to prove my doctrine. And here it is very important that we proceed with caution and build upon solid ground. For if our system should at last prove false, we should be left in a very dreadful condition. To prevent such a calamity we should *invent* such arguments in support of our doctrine as will fully *satisfy our minds* of its truth. Here then I would observe,

1. That the gospel could not be good news to such persons as we are, if it did not contain the doctrine of universal salvation. It would be a hard case indeed, if only those could be saved who repent and renounce their sins. Such a condition could not afford *us* the least comfort. The offer of salvation on such terms would be no good tidings to us. It would rather alarm our fears and deprive us of hope. But a notable preacher of ours has often laid it down as a maxim, that whatever views of religion excite fear or make people unhappy cannot be the gospel. Indeed what does a man want religion for, if it be not to ease his conscience, quiet his fears, and make him cheerful and contented, so often as he looks back at his past life? A man, for example, has cheated in trade, or debauched his neighbour's wife; or been rather loose and irregular in his habits, and when he sits down to reflect, he feels rather troubled in mind; he is apt to judge himself too severely; his old superstitious prejudices rise up and he fears sometimes that he shall be damned in the coming world. Now how can the gospel be good tidings to such a man, if it offer him salvation only on condition of his repenting and forsaking his sins—a condition with which he has no heart to comply? But on the other hand, how delightful it must be for him to know that the mercy of God can extend to the vilest sinner on earth;—nay that this vileness only serves to shew how much more merciful God can be. The more sins he has committed, the more mercy in pardoning them. This is glad tidings indeed! This is a gospel for *us*. It is just what we need! for unless the gates of heaven are wide enough for all, it will certainly fare ill with very many of our party.

2. Our wishes prove this doctrine true. Yes, my brethren, however paradoxical it may seem, I boldly say that our strong wishes prove this doctrine very strongly. For have you never observed the influence of men's wishes in the whole system of life; and especially in forming and establishing their sentiments? There are innumerable things, which, if you only wish them, immediately come to pass, or are readily believed to be true. For example, a man wishes to go to the tavern, he is there; a young heir wishes to spend his estate, it is gone; a merchant wishes to be dishonest, he is so; or a youth wishes to be profligate, and he succeeds to the full extent of his hopes. Thus, you see, only wish a thing, and that thing will be. The scripture says, that heaven is bought without money and without

price; that is, it is to be obtained very cheap; and what can be cheaper than a Universalist's wish? The same is true in regard to belief. A man wishes it were right to cheat his neighbour, and he soon believes it is right. Or he wishes it were right to break the Sabbath, to profane the name of God, to neglect the Bible and prayer, and he readily comes to the belief that he may safely and innocently pursue either of these courses of conduct. It is evident then that whatever a man wishes to be true, he easily believes, is true. Now how strongly does every Universalist wish that all men might be saved? How abhorrent to every desire of his heart, is the notion that there is a hell, where the wicked are to be punished for their sins? But he has only to *wish* a thing to be, and it comes to pass; only to wish a sentiment to be true, and he fully believes it; and the scripture says, He that believeth shall be saved.

3. The goodness of God proves the doctrine true. How obvious is it, my brethren, that if God is a being of benevolence he must delight in the happiness of his creatures? And if he delights in their happiness, will he ever make any of them miserable? "Doth not every good man love his enemies and forgive even the worst of them? Is there a man living, whose heart is filled with the love of God, that would not promote the best interests of his inveterate foe, if it lay in his power? And has not God more love than the best of men? And are not his wisdom and his power equal to his love?" This argument, I must confess, appears to me perfectly conclusive; and I am surprised that any one can resist its force. It has sometimes been objected, I know, that the argument is opposed to facts, and must be false. God, it is asserted, has inflicted great judgments on men for their sins. He drowned the old world; he destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah with fire from heaven; and at many different times, he has poured out the vials of his wrath upon the children of disobedience. And it is said, if it be consistent with the goodness of God to inflict pain and suffering on the guilty in this world, it may be consistent for him to do the same in the world to come. It is added, moreover, that God may be good though he make a distinction between the righteous and the wicked—rewarding the one and punishing the other according to their deserts.

Godness in God, it is said, no more requires him to treat the righteous and the wicked alike; or that he should save impenitent rebels from deserved punishment, than goodness in a magistrate requires him to suffer murderers to live and the guilty in general to go unpunished.

This objection, it must be confessed, seems plausible; and it might not be easy to answer it. Still we know God is benevolent; he is good, he is merciful, he is love itself; and cannot therefore make any of his creatures miserable; and this is enough to satisfy our minds. What are facts when opposed to *our* theory?

4. If we take *certain* views of scripture, we shall find it expressly recorded, that all men shall be saved. In the third chapter of Genesis, the fourth verse, it is fully written, *Ye shall not surely die.*

These words are found in the book of God. In the seventy-third Psalm, seventh verse, it is recorded expressly for the consolation of the wicked, *Their eyes stand out with fatness, they have more than heart could wish.* In another Psalm it is said, *There is no God.* Now if there is no God, how can he send sinners to hell? In the gospel of Mark it is said, *their worm dieth.* Probably the worm is now dead. The wise king of Jerusalem says, *Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart and in the sight of thine eyes.* This is excellent; this is just what one would wish. Again, it is said, *a remnant shall be saved.* And if even a remnant shall be saved, how plain it is that the whole will be saved? In innumerable pages of the Bible, you may find it written *all, all men*; in other places *go*; in other places, *to heaven*; which being put together, reads thus, *All men go to heaven.* This is not only scripture, but chosen scripture, selected scripture, the best part of scripture. It is only necessary to select and bring detached parts of the Bible together, to make out a complete proof of our doctrine.

With this view of the subject, you must immediately see, that the whole history of scripture agrees. There were the inhabitants of the world in the time of the flood. All were wicked, except righteous Noah and his family. He built an ark, the rest were drowned. What became of them, think ye? What? They were all saved. They were swept to heaven by the besom of destruction. The antediluvians, you must know, were of our party; and a likely story indeed! that all of our side are to be sent to hell, and none saved but a few of the Noah family; who I suppose were of the Calvinistic persuasion. There were the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah—They did not behave quite so well as they ought; yet, as it appears, they were true Universalists; I cannot but think we ought to have some charity for them. No doubt they got to heaven at last; they rose from the midst of the fire and brimstone which God in his wrath reigned upon them, to the mansions of purity and bliss. There was the troop of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. They went down into the pit. What pit? Why the pit of heaven. There was Judas Iscariot; he swung to heaven on his own halter. Thus you see, that it appears perfectly *natural*, and altogether in agreement with the history of the Bible, that all should be saved. This view of the subject gives us a delightful prospect of the joys of heaven. It shews us at least, we shall have good company there. I put it to your conscience, my brethren, should you not rather spend your eternity with a set of jovial companions, of some life and spirit; than to live for ever with a collection of those unhappy people who attend prayer meetings, and are always talking on the subject of religion? The *common sense* of our party, I am sure, must answer this question without a moment's hesitation.

Thus I have proved by strong and incontestible arguments, that there is no such place as hell. Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy. Fear

not, for your salvation is secure. You can do nothing to help or to hinder it. But,

II. I proceed to the second part of my subject, which is to show the advantages of this doctrine. *The words are sweeter than honey or the honey comb.*

1. One peculiar advantage of our system is, that it attracts the attention and interests the feelings of several classes of persons who would otherwise pay no regard to religion. You must know that the gloomy and forbidding aspect, in which the Calvinists especially present religion, is very offensive to persons of free and generous sentiments. Hence in places where none but Calvinistic preaching is enjoyed, there are many who, rather than be annoyed by its warnings and denunciations, quit the house of God, neglect the sabbath, and pay no regard to religion of any kind. For this numerous and diversified class of persons, our doctrine has peculiar charms. They rejoice to find in it just what quiets their consciences and lulls their fears. Indeed, my brethren, it is most interesting to observe what different characters have at once their attention to religion excited, whenever the trump of universal salvation is blown in any populous place. Deists, who have for a course of years maintained violent opposition to Christianity; profane swearers, and persons who have been in the habit of spending the sabbath in business or amusements; the entire class of tipplers, and gamblers, and cheats, with the whole company of such as hate missionary and bible societies, and are opposed to religious stirrs—all these will at once turn out when *our* standard is erected, and hear with great edification and comfort that there is no hell, and that the path of the sinner leads as directly to heaven, as the path of the just. What a glorious thing it is, that our system is so entirely adapted to the wants and wishes of these various sorts of persons; that it can gather them out of the highways, and lanes, and hedges, yea, and the grog-shop too, and bring them together, to hear good tidings of great joy? Certain I am, that in this respect, our system of religion has the advantage over every other that has yet been published.

2. The prevalence of our doctrine must tend to make business exceedingly brisk and lively. It must have a most facilitating influence on certain kinds of conveyance of property. I have not the least doubt, could Universalism universally prevail, that money would slide from hand to hand with universal ease. The traveller would be delivered of his load; the mail carrier from the care of his leather bag. Stages would roll under lighter burdens; post-masters be freed from every temptation to be dishonest. Look at those doughty champions who lately attempted to rob the mail near Baltimore. Had they believed there is a hell, would they, suppose you, have so fearlessly exposed themselves to the blunderbuss and pistols of the guard? No, my brethren, they had no fear of a future state of retribution; they made the attack with the full assurance, that if they should have their brains blowed out, their souls would go directly to heaven; and how consoling it must be to them now in prison, to reflect that in a few weeks or months,

they shall ascend from the gallows to the mansions of bliss! O happy effects of the truth! Only let our sentiments prevail, and we should see an entire revolution in human affairs; it would be the *universal millennium*. O happy age! when all remorse and fear and trembling shall be done away; when all restraints, being taken from the consciences and the hands of men, joy and gladness shall every where abound; and it shall be more truly said of us, than it was of the ancient Christians—the multitude of them *that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed were his own*. O happy age! when the chains of Calvinism shall be broken; when the gloomy doctrines of the Genevan shall no longer hold the human mind in bondage, but a *jubilee* shall be proclaimed throughout the world, and *universal emancipation* shall take place.

Indeed, it is owing to the *moderate* prevalence of our principles, that much of the present business of the world is carried on. Men are obliged to be *practical Universalists*, or there would be no living. What would become of half of the poison in the apothecaries' shops, if it were not for our faith and practice? How would certain merchants subsist, who live by measuring out liquor in gills and glasses? What would become of all the distilleries from Georgia to Maine, on whose abundant and overflowing streams multitudes are every year borne to the ocean of endless bliss? What would become of courts of justice; of constables, sheriffs and turnkeys? What would lawyers have to do? What alteration would there be in making bargains? I am perfectly astonished at the temerity of those who wish to suppress our sentiments. Do they mean to tear up the foundations of society; discourage industry; knock the greater part of business in the head, and produce a universal stagnation? Thank heaven, they have no great prospect of succeeding. Whilst human nature is on our side, and the prince of the world continues to reign, no doubt our cause will prosper. What a happy day will it be, when all restrictions on business shall be removed; when the embargo of conscience shall be repealed; when the non-intercourse act of honesty shall be rescinded; when the commercial restrictions from hell shall be for ever nullified, and every man shall be left to do what is right in his own eyes, *having none to molest or make him afraid*. Blessed age! my heart longeth for thee.

8. Another advantage to be hoped from our religion is, the comfort it must afford to people under certain kinds of affliction. Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards; and to confess the truth, the Universalist has his full share in this world, though he is to have none in the next. Our lives are very short, and many of our party *don't live out half their days*. Ah! how consoling it is to believe that they are carried quick to heaven. What a contrast must heaven be to some of our friends. Taken from New-Holland, from Botany-Bay, from Newgate; from all the prisons and galleys in Asia, Africa, America and Europe, and conveyed by angels to a world where there are no turnkeys, no whipping-

posts, no sheriff's officers, none of our *peculiar sorrows* or cares. If reduced to difficulties, it becomes necessary for any of us to commit suicide—how delightful to think it may be done, with entire safety! Or if we wish to put a rich old miser out of the way, in order to inherit his property, how pleasant to believe that we have only sent him to heaven; and if we are detected and hanged, that we shall go after him. O, my brethren, there is great joy and peace in believing.

4. Our doctrine greatly promotes the pleasures of religion;

"Religion never was design'd,
To make our pleasures less."

The pleasures of religion, according to the belief of some, are confined to a few persons, and a very few actions; whereas we spread the pleasures of religion over all the walks of life. Our system frees us entirely from bondage of fear and remorse; and from all that dull routine of duties to which Calvinism subjects its votaries.

The moment a man becomes a Universalist, he feels no more uneasiness respecting his sins, or his future condition; his mind is filled with peace and joy in believing; he is blessed with all the privileges and hopes of the system, and floats down the stream of life unapprehensive of danger, and unsollicitous for the future. And all this, he enjoys, without having his worldly pleasures in the least interrupted; without having any thing to do with the dull business of watching over his heart, or of praying in his family and closet. Our religion is perfect freedom. It may go with a man to the tavern, and the gaming table, and the brothel; and if he has pretty strong faith, climb with him to the topmost round of the ladder. *Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace*.

5. Those who adopt our opinions are delivered from the fear of death. The bible says expressly,—*There are no bands in their death*; and this declaration entirely corresponds with facts. Look at Cummings and McDuffie; look at many other gentlemen of honour; see with what courage they can point the pistol and face the deadly weapon! Do you suppose that such persons believe there is a hell? No, my brethren, they are true sons of the faith; they believe in no hell; they have exploded all such superstitious notions, and hence their fortitude and courage in attempting to kill each other.

So in other cases. When I see men calmly and fearlessly walking according to the course of this world; when I notice their freedom from the shackles of superstition and the restraint of conscience; when I hear them speak of death without concern, and of their future state without fear, I say to myself, these are true sons of the faith; they believe in no hell. This confidence while passing through life; this fearlessness of death does peculiar honour to our religion; and would to God, my brethren, that it were always carried through. But alas! How many of our party fall from their steadfastness, and cry out for fear at the very time when they most need our doctrine for their support? What a dishonour,—what a reproach is this? They believe

in a hell after all. One would think from their terrors, that in the last hour they often almost see it before their eyes. What doth it profit, my brother, if a may say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him? The faith of these men is dead, I am sure.

Lastly. Our belief is greatly calculated to make religion spread. Methinks every body must love such a God as ours. I have always been surprised that the apostles met with so much opposition in publishing the glad tidings of universal salvation. Probably their persecutors were Calvinists, who always have been, are now, mortally opposed to our system of religion. But thank heaven, their number and their influence are fast diminishing. People are beginning to get their eyes open. In this enlightened age, with so many *learned* and *able* preachers as we have, superstition must vanish, and all the advocates of Calvinism must hide their heads. Only make people Universalists, and religion will revive; for Universalism is a very reviving religion. Many will be won over to the faith, to whom you might preach the old system to all eternity, and they would not believe it. Nor would their conversion be attended with any such noise or show, as attends those religious stirs, in which people pretend they are regenerated and made to pass from death unto life,—No; converts to Universalism make no noise about their conversion; they do not pretend to any such unaccountable thing as conviction of sin, or a change of heart. They continue just what they were before; pursue the same course of life; unite with the same merry companions, and enjoy the same pleasures and amusements. Besides, our faith will be perfectly practical. Only persuade the world to embrace our creed, and I will engage for them that their faith and practice shall agree.

Thus I have preached to you the true gospel. *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy.* I appeal to your consciences, if it has not been good news to you. Let me then, in conclusion, exhort you all to renounce your former opinions and embrace this faith. You have heard what arguments have been adduced, and what advantages presented; and now if you would not go through life, haunted with the gloomy idea that there is a hell; that God is angry with the wicked every day; and that he who dies without repentance shall perish in everlasting fire; then become Universalists, and be freed from all these fearful apprehensions. I leave you then with adding this single weighty consideration; and I beseech you to ponder it well, and to fix it deeply in your minds. If you embrace this system, and it should *happen* at last to prove true, you will certainly be saved; but if you should *reject* it, and it should at last prove true, what will become of you? O what! Why, you will be saved.

HYMN.

"When seas shall waste, and skies in smoke decay,
Rocks fall to dust, and mountains melt away;
In adamant chains shall death be bound,
And hell's grim tyrant feel the eternal wound."
But all his children reach fair Eden's shore,
Not e'er to see their father Satan more.

The tottering drunkard shall to glory reel,
And common strumpets endless pleasure feel.
Blest are the haughty who despise the poor,
For they're entitled to the heavenly store.
Blest all who laugh and scoff at truth divine,
For bold revilers endless comfort find.
Blest are the clamorous and contentious crew,
To them eternal rest and peace is due.
Blest all who hunger, and who thirst to find
A chance to plunder and to cheat mankind;
Such die in peace—for to them, God has given,
To be unjust on earth, and go to heaven.
Blest is the wretch whose bowels never move
With generous pity or with tender love;
He shall find mercy from the God above.
Blest all who seek to wrangle or to fight,
Such mount from seas of blood to worlds of light.
Go riot, drink, and every ill pursue,
For joys eternal are reserv'd for you.
Fear not to sin till death shall close your eyes;
Live as you please, yours is th' immortal prize.

From the (Canandaigua) Plain Truth.

JUDGMENTS.

The exertions which are constantly made by some thorough-going zealots among us to convert every death that occurs by casualty into a particular judgment from heaven, deserve some notice. Our readers all know that *Ignorance and Superstition* have ever been intimate associates; and for this reason, some people are so very anxious to prevent their neighbour's reading any publications but such as they shall select for them. Their object is easily seen through: the less general information a parishioner has, the more readily will he accredit any absurdity told him by the preacher. When the merciless fangs of ignorance have been effectually fixed, no absurdity is too gross to be acceptable. The Pope of Rome instructs his followers that he is God's special agent here upon earth, and they believe it. When he tells them of the supernatural properties of some "*saint's toe nail*," that he has in his possession, the deluded multitude never *think* of disbelieving the tale. Just so it is much nearer home. If a man do not think and believe the same as the priest and deacons of his parish, and any accident happens to him or his property, it is placed to the credit of his infidelity; and every zealous gossip of the neighbourhood is immediately on duty to spread the news. Children, and other simple ones are ever ready to listen and repeat, until the tale is worn down, by constant use, into an admitted fact, treasured up in the archives of *Judgments*, to be dealt out to posterity in such portions as their wavering faith may require.

In all these cases of "*awful warnings*"—for this is the name by which they are known—there are two powerful agents employed, viz. The devil, so called, and the Almighty Author of our existence! The former of these makes it his business to seduce the victim, and bring him into the wicked measures, while the latter stands ready, and at the proper time inflicts the merited penalty.

The most common weapon employed now-a-days, if we can believe those who kindly exert themselves to solve all dark subjects of the kind, is *electric fluid*, by which persons often lost their lives or

property; and seldom, if ever, without being construed into a *Judgment*. Hence it is taken for granted that the individual so afflicted has been uncommonly wicked; else he would have escaped. This opinion is "orthodox" enough, as it was a favourite one of the noted *Cotton Mather*, who figures most notably in the early history of New-England. This man was once "pastor of the North Church in Boston," and has written a work of some magnitude, entitled "Ecclesiastical History of New-England, from the year 1620, to the year 1698." This work, though quite a text book with some, is very imperfectly known to readers generally. It is a full length portrait of Superstition, as she was in the age in which it treats, and is well worthy the attention of all who would wish to profit by the blind fanaticism of their ancestors. The author, as we said before, was fully in the belief that the fatal effects of *electric fluid* were judgments from heaven, *though inflicted by the devil!* And yet he passes a severe censure upon the New-England clergy, when he says, "*Our meeting houses and our ministers' houses have had a singular share in the strokes of thunder.*"

At page 312 of his second volume (1st American Edition) Dr. Mather has a chapter with the title: "*Relating Remarkables done by thunder,*" from which we quote the following, as a curiosity:

"There [in the air] Satan can do mighty things, command much of the magazine of heaven, where that dreadful artillery, which makes men tremble, these fiery meteors, thunder and lightning, are stored and lodged. Satan, let loose by God, can do wonders in the air: He can raise storms, he can discharge the great ordnance of heaven, thunder and lightning; and by his art can make them *more terrible and dreadful* than they are in their own nature. [So the devil, it seems, can *improve* upon the works of our Heavenly Father! In this case, pray which possesses the greatest power?] 'Tis no heresy or blasphemy to think that the prince of the power of the air hath as good skill in *chymistry* as goes to the making of *AURUM FULMINANS*. [An accomplished fellow, this devil!] But this concession does the more powerfully bespeak our acknowledgment of the great God, the *high thunderer*, who limits those destroyers for all misapplications of his thunderbolts.

"All that I shall add, is this; It has been seen that thunders *oftener* fall upon houses of God than upon any other houses; New-England can say so. *Our meeting houses and our ministers' houses* have had a singular share in the strokes of thunder!!"

Here is a lesson for anathematizers of the present day. Houses of worship and the parson's dwellings were more frequently struck by lightning, or, as the "Dr." has it, by "thunder," than any other buildings; and yet he says, "the Great God, the high thunderer," always superintended, and prevented the devil's ever misapplying the thunderbolts! Of course, then, on the score of *Judgments*, they were properly applied to these buildings. It is hardly necessary to remark, that the natural and *real* cause why so many meeting houses were struck

by lightning in those days, is to be found in the great height to which their *steeple*s were carried. Unprotected as they were by lightning rods, which were not then in use, these served as attractors of the electric fluid; and hence came all the miracle. The dwellings of the parsons were usually located near the churches, and from this cause, doubtless, often suffered; and further, they were, next to the church, the *largest* and most *lofty* buildings in the neighbourhood, and, of course, presented the most prominent points of attraction to the electric fluid. Should any zealot reject these natural causes, and still insist upon the devil's agency in them, in order to make out his favourite theory of *Judgments*, he is requested to inform us why the churches and the *priests who officiated in them*, were so especially annoyed in New-England, in the days of *Cotton Mather*?

MR. JAMES FENN, of Schenectady, (N. Y.) formerly a Baptist preacher in England, but now a believer in Universal Salvation, reasons as follows, on

THE ATTRIBUTES OF DEITY.

All will admit that the Being who created all things, and governs all things, must be infinitely wise, powerful and good; that all his other attributes harmonize with and centre in these. His wisdom planned all things, his power brought all things into being, his love and goodness direct all things; nothing, therefore, can exist, but what must harmonize with these attributes of Deity. Of course all discord, sin and misery must come to an end, that God's wisdom, power and goodness may harmonize in all his works, and prove God to be infinitely wise and good to all his creatures. Should any of God's creatures be eternally miserable, it would show a want of wisdom in the Creator not to foresee it; or, if foreseen, a want of love not to prevent it, or a want of power or will to make his creatures happy. We may rest assured, God is infinitely perfect in all his attributes and in all his works, and of course he will seek the happiness of all his creatures; nor will he suffer everlasting misery and discord to remain in any part of his vast empire; but, on the contrary, holiness, harmony, and love will pervade all the creation of God; in this will be displayed the infinite wisdom, power, and love of Almighty God to all his works; all his creatures will be brought to see the harmony of their Maker's attributes in their own eternal happiness; all will be united to God, and will glorify him without end. That this will be the final result of God's government, his infinite wisdom and goodness must fully prove; for if God is infinitely good, which none dare to deny, he cannot consistently with himself, create beings that would experience more misery than happiness. 2dly. If God is infinitely good, his goodness must be commensurate with his power and knowledge, then all beings that his power has produced, must be the objects of his care and goodness. To prove any being destitute of that goodness, would prove the knowledge of God did not extend to that being. 3dly. There is as much pro-

priety in saying that God is infinite in power, but did not create all things, as there is in saying God is infinite in goodness, yet but a part of his creatures will ever partake of it. 4thly. If the Almighty possesses power sufficient to make all his creatures happy, and yet has no mind that they should be happy, then it could not be an act of goodness in God to create them, but an act of cruelty. The opposers of universal salvation are brought to this point, either to say, that God would have saved all men, but could not; or, that he could have saved them, and would not; the conclusion, therefore, from this must be, that the power or the goodness of God must fail, or that all men will be saved. But, to be more particular, let us attend to what the holy scripture says on this subject of divine goodness to man, especially as it relates to the attributes of love and goodness in the Almighty.

We are told by the inspired apostle, St. John, that *God is love*; not that he possesses a degree of love that leads him to act towards some of his creatures with kindness and to others the reverse of it, or, to some of his creatures to be kind at one time and unkind at another, but that *God is love*, love in the abstract, his very nature is love. John says, *He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him, for God is love*, perfect love, unchangeable love, eternal love. That the love of God is thus perfect, I presume none will deny, or even call it in question. If the love of God be thus perfect, it cannot be partial in its object, or changeable in its nature; I conclude, therefore, if God loved man when he first made him, and pronounced him to be very good, he must always love him—at all times, and under all circumstances, and of course can never leave him in endless misery and despair, but will do all that is consistent with his own nature to make man finally happy. God's conduct towards men began in love—it progressed in love—it will continue in love to all eternity. It may well be said, *the Lord delighteth in mercy*; that *his tender mercies are over all his works*; that *he doth not afflict the children of men willingly, but for their profit, that they may be partakers of his holiness*; that *he retaineth not his anger for ever because he delighteth in mercy*. Thus we see God's nature is love; love governs his conduct towards all his creatures, at all times; nor can he, nor will he act on any other principle than that of perfect love to all his creatures; nor is it possible that an infinitely wise, powerful and good God, can act otherwise; his nature leads him to pursue the greatest possible good; this will finally end in the restoration of all things, and the endless happiness of all intelligent nature. This must be the great object divine love had in view, in creation, in his providence, and in redemption; for a being of infinite power, wisdom and love, can have nothing less in view than the final happiness of all his creatures.

The idea of eternal punishment for sin, or eternal damnation, is as inconsistent with the nature of God as it is with common sense, and the happiness of mankind; it is a doctrine dishonourable to God, discouraging to man, and a contradiction to the di-

vine attributes; for infinite goodness and endless wrath can no more exist together, than light and darkness, or fire and water. The self-existent and eternal God, who is infinite in power, wisdom and goodness, "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, who retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy," can never bring into existence and support in being, endless misery, a thing so opposed to his nature, and the greatest good of his creatures.

But a further proof of God's love, and that he has no mind to make man miserable, is seen in his wise and gracious scheme of redemption by Jesus Christ, which redemption embraces the whole human family and the reconciliation of all things to God. Col. i. 19, 20.—If God appointed his Son to ransom all the race of man, as, Heb. ii. 9. 1 Tim. ii. 6. If Christ is to reconcile all things to God, Col. i. 19. If there is a time appointed for the restoration of all things, Acts iii. 21, then there will be no such thing as endless misery for any of God's creatures, but harmony, peace and joy will pervade the whole universe of God. This glorious scheme of redemption, of restoring all men to happiness, is the most wonderful display of the wisdom, power and love of God, that can possibly be thought of. This glorious attribute of divine goodness governs the Almighty in his conduct to all his creatures, at all times; nor can he, nor will he act on any other principle than that of perfect goodness to any of his creatures, either in the present or a future state. Whatever afflictions or sufferings God sends upon his creatures, are acts of mercy for their good; nor is it possible that a wise and good God can act otherwise, for his nature must lead him to pursue the greatest possible good. Surely this must afford every generous heart, unspeakable pleasure, to view the extent of God's mercy in the final happiness of all; nor can such feel a wish that this doctrine should not prove true; a doctrine, on which depends, in some measure, the honour of God, and the happiness of a large portion of the human race. We further read in the gospel of St. John, iii. 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands;" and chap. xiii. 3, Jesus "knew the Father had given all things into his hands;" that "he came from God and went to God." This favourite of the Father says, John vi. 37, 39—"All that the father giveth me shall come to me;—and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out, for I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me: and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." That is, at the last day the Mediator shall restore all things to the Father. See Acts iii. 21. Eph. i. 10. and John xvii. 2. The Son says to the Father, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou has given him." Thus we see the Father has given all things to the Son, that the Son will raise them all up at the last day, and will give them eternal life. Thus "was God in Christ, reconciling the

world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." 2 Cor. v. 19. "For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell, and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Col. i. 19, 20.—Thus teaches the word of God; this is the doctrine for which I plead; this is the gospel Christ commanded to be preached to every creature in all the world, Mark xvi. 16. This plan of redemption that centers in the happiness of all men, proclaims the infinite wisdom and love of God to all intelligent nature, and will end in the everlasting glory of the great Jehovah.

Univ. Mag.

CALVINISTS' ARTICLES, &c.

The following extracts are from the "*Articles of Faith and Practice, of the First Baptist Church in Lansingburgh.*" The reader will perceive that these religionists hold to the monstrous absurdity that "mankind are under the greatest moral obligation to love God with all their heart," when God hates them, as *non-elect*, and from eternity wisely determined they should be eternally damned. Now, if there exists such a thing or being, as these good people call the *Devil*, we should like to know, whether mankind, the *non-elect*, "are under the greatest obligation to love him, with all their heart?" Whether the devil is not quite as *deserving* of their love and esteem? Or, whether the Devil is a being the reverse of their God, and loving those whom God hates, deserves the hatred of those whom he loves? This is consistent. The premises will admit of no other conclusions. We earnestly request these Calvinists to answer, and assign reasons, and produce testimony for all their opinions and assertions. We believe, that if their God is what they describe him, their devil must be as much better than their God, as he differs from him. For it would be a monstrous conclusion, that their God and their Devil were *opposed* in all things, and at the same time, *united* heart and hand in the project of making mankind *endlessly miserable*! In a word—the Calvinists represent God and the Devil to be of one mind, and co-workers in the destruction of mankind!

"Art. 3. We believe that God, from all eternity, has pursued his own sovereign and infinitely wise plan, in all his works and ways; and that he will continue eternally so to do: Hence all things he has revealed and accomplished, and that will be brought to pass by him, are but the result of his holy, wise, and determinate counsel, from eternity.

"Art. 4. We believe that God did elect in Christ, before the world began, all those that are saved, whom he did predestinate to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, of his own free grace, and according to the good pleasure of his will.

"Art. 5. We believe that God created Adam upright and holy, capable of keeping the law of God; but he, by transgression, fell from his original rectitude and communion with God; and all his posterity fell in him, and are by nature corrupt, carnal, averse to good, prone to evil, children of wrath, un-

der condemnation; subject to corporeal, involved in moral, and deserving eternal death; from all which there is no deliverance, but by Christ the second Adam:

"Art. 8. We believe all mankind are under the greatest moral obligation to love God with all their heart, and their neighbour as themselves; to repent of sin, and believe the record God has given of his Son.

"Art. 10. We believe that the justification of all whom God hath predestinated to the adoption of children, is by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, without works, and apprehended by faith; and that pardon of sin is only through the blood of Christ, according to the riches of his grace.

"Art. 13. We believe that Christ will come to raise the dead and judge the world; when he will take vengeance on the wicked, and receive his weary bride to his kingdom; and that the torments of the damned, and the happiness and glory of the righteous, will be eternal in duration."

DEDICATION.

The new UNIVERSALIST CHURCH in Callowhill-street, was solemnly dedicated to the service of Almighty God, yesterday afternoon, (Oct. 17,) in the presence of a numerous and attentive auditory, assembled to participate in the holy ordinances necessary to the occasion. Br. Abner Kneeland officiated in the duties of the ceremony. A sermon was also delivered by Mr. Morse in the evening. The church was well filled on both these occasions, and not only a solemn, but a very devout attention was given to the discourses, both of afternoon and evening, while an excellent choir of singers added brilliancy to the scene.

Phil. Ev. Post.

NEW CHURCH.

It may gratify our distant friends, to learn, that the House now building by the "Second Society of United Christian Friends," in this city, is advancing to completion, and will be so far finished as to afford a place of worship by January next. This House will be large and commodious, combining *strength* with *comfort*, and that plainness of manner, and absence of *fashionable* folly and tinsel, which is indispensable to preserve any appearance of analogy between the *House*, and the *humility* of the worshippers. "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto *gold*, or *silver*, or *stone*, graven by art and man's device." Acts xvii. 29.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on Friday Evenings at seven o'clock. The object of this society is one of universal interest. All religious denominations therefore, are invited to attend.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1823.

NO. 26.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—In a late number of the Gospel Herald, I observed an extract from a letter from Mr. Worrall, of Glasgow, in which he limits the number of congregations in Scotland, professing faith in God's universal love, to *three*. Now this statement is very far below the truth. There are in Scotland, six or eight Unitarian churches, who zealously believe, and who proclaim it both from the pulpit and the press; and if we take into account the English Unitarians, among whom I believe there is not one advocate of *endless* misery, we will have an addition of four hundred congregations, as much entitled to the name of Universalists as Mr. Worrall's churches.

In proof of the *Universalism* of the British Unitarians, take the following facts: All their leading writers have espoused it: Dr. Priestly, in several of his works; Mr. Lindsey, in his *Conversations on the Divine Government*, showing that every thing is from God, and for good to *all*. Dr. Estlin, Mr. Grundy, Mr. Yates, Mr. Belsham, and Mr. Wright, in their numerous works. Also, Dr. Smith, late minister of the Unitarian church in Edinburgh, now of Yeovil, England, in his admirable work, entitled "*Illustrations of the Divine Government*;" tending to show that every thing is under the direction of infinite Wisdom and goodness, and will terminate in the production of universal purity and happiness. This excellent work, first printed in Glasgow, in 1816, has since passed through two London editions, and has received the decided approbation of the Unitarians as a body.

Let us next turn to the "*Improved Version of the New Testament*," published by the "Unitarian Society, for promoting Christian knowledge, and the practice of virtue, by the distribution of books." Their note on Matt. xxv. 46, reads thus—"The word here rendered *punishment*, properly signifies *correction*, inflicted for the benefit of the offender; and the word translated *everlasting*, is often used to express a long, but *indefinite* duration. This text, therefore, so far from giving countenance to the harsh doctrine of endless misery, is rather favourable to the more pleasing and more probable hypothesis of the ultimate restitution of the wicked to virtue and to happiness." On 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23, they have the following note—"Here the apostle evidently considers Christ as a mere man, as much as Adam was; *death* being introduced by one man, and *eternal life* by another. It is also to be observed, that *all*, without exception, who die in Adam, will participate in this glorious resurrection by Christ. Not indeed, *all* at the same time, but each in his

own order; first Christ, afterwards all virtuous persons and true believers at his second coming; lastly cometh the end, the grand consummation of all things, when all his enemies shall be put under his feet, and all things shall be subdued unto him. That is, when all natural and moral evil shall be exterminated, and death shall be swallowed up in victory. This is that glorious issue of the Divine administration to which the gospel encourages us to look forward, and for which it is intended to qualify and prepare all who practically embrace it. Blessed and holy is he who hath part in the *first* resurrection, over such the second death hath no power."

The Unitarians universally reject the silly notion of the *personal* existence of the *devil*. They have three periodical publications; two in London, the "*Monthly Repository*," and the "*Christian Reformer*." One in Liverpool, the "*Christian Reflector*."

There is another body of Unitarian Universalists, known by the name of "*Free-thinking Christians*." They published a periodical work, "*The Free-Thinking Christian's Quarterly Register*," designed to maintain the pure principles of Christianity against priestcraft, orthodoxy, and infidelity. They resemble the Quakers in their church government; having no clergy nor any form of social worship. They consider that prayer ought to be wholly confined to the closet. A portion of Scripture is appointed to be discussed every Sabbath, and all are at liberty to give their opinion of it. But, as they use their *reason* in expounding the Scriptures, there is none of that silent waiting for the Spirit, and frequent disappointment when it does not visit them, that occurs in Quaker meetings.

I am, with much esteem, yours; &c. J. L.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

A NEW CALLING FOR THE CLERGY.

Mr. Editor—The attentive observer of the times, and particularly of the maneuvering of the clergy, for the last four years, would very rationally conclude, that the stock of *artifice* employed in wheeling money from the pockets of the community, to perpetuate the influence of the "*sacred few*," must be nearly exhausted, and that the renowned invention of manufacturing "*pudding sticks*," to replenish "*the treasury of the Lord*," would be an apt *item* for bringing "*up the rear*," in the comical catalogue of *ways and means*, adopted by modern religionists for the "*salvation of the heathen*." But such is not the case. Facts, indubitably prove the contrary. A new device has been hit upon by these truly *legitimate geniuses*, which reflects upon them equal credit with all the rest. It is this—The Clergy

turning ALMANAC PEDDLERS!! I have been credibly informed, that in a number of towns, in this county, clergymen have advertised from their respective pulpits, the "*Christian Almanac for 1824.*" Expatriating largely upon its merits, its object, and the immense benefits that are calculated to result from its circulation, as its profits all go into the *Missionary Fund*—calling upon their hearers to purchase of them, and enjoining it upon them *not to purchase any other kind!!!* A pretty expedient this, really, the pulpit become a common stall, and its minister the attendant. O, shame, where is thy blush!

Figure to yourself, Mr. Editor, for a moment, the *Reverend Doctor Paul*, instead of holding forth to his impassioned audience, in his customary way, exhorting them to a love of "*justice, mercy, and truth,*" see him in his *gilded church*, with a bundle of the *Christian Almanac*, (that invaluable publication) before him. Hear him expatiate on their incomparable merits, dealing out to his hearers, nice calculations of the probable extent the *profits* of each Almanac will go towards saving some poor ignorant heathen from the gulf of eternal wretchedness, urging them to purchase, and purchase liberally too, and by that means do something towards "*redeeming* the millions who are daily and hourly sinking down to the regions of never-ending wo." What think you, Mr. Editor, would have been the reply of *his Master* to such a course of conduct? Speaking in the most mild manner possible, should we not read it in something like the following—"Paul, what meanest thou? Did I not commission thee to go forth and promulgate *life and salvation* to poor erring man, and on my death and resurrection, to predicate the glorious resurrection of the *whole human family*—enjoining it upon thee to take neither *purse nor scrip*, on thy journey, but trust to whom thou wert sent for support? Freely as thou hast received, *so freely give*. Is not the pledge given, that I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me? Did I not instruct thee, that my mission was to seek and save a lost world? Have I not declared it is *finished*? And dost thou now talk of purchasing that, (with silver and gold) of which I am the rightful inheritor from the foundation of the world? Paul, surely thou art beside thyself. *Ambition* hath made thee mad!!"

But enough; there is something so ridiculous in the numerous measures resorted to of late, for advancing what is said to be the *Redeemer's Kingdom*, that we cannot but hope they will eventuate in self-destruction. They are a disgrace to the present age, and are only worthy of the dark reign of *popery and fanaticism*. For poor frail man to talk of purchasing the favour of Almighty God, and of bringing souls back to Christ, for the consideration of a few *paltry pence*, is absurd in the extreme. And we humbly trust that the steady march of reason, will, ere long, lay prostrate every ideal scheme of this description, and that the time will eventually come, "when man shall rise, regenerate, in the noble attitude of his nature, and learn the great truth, that the good of all is the universal interest."

Fairfield county, (Con.) Oct. 1823. C.

AN APPEAL

To the Serious and Candid Professors of Christianity.—By Dr. T. S. Smith.—Birmingham: printed for M. Taylor. 1820.

There can be no doubt, that, if such a most extraordinary doctrine as that there are three equal persons in one undivided essence, were really revealed in Scripture, the proof of it could be pointed out; for such a doctrine could not possibly be disclosed, in doubtful or obscure language. The nature of it requires, that it should be clearly and expressly stated; and if mankind were ever ignorant of it, that ignorance could not be removed but by this clear and express statement. Where, then, in the Old or New Testament, is this statement to be found? Where does it say, that there are three persons in one God? We know where, in the Old Testament, it is affirmed, by Jehovah himself, *Besides me there is no God*. Isaiah xlv. 6.—*I, even I, am he, and THERE IS NO GOD WITH ME*. Deut. xxxii. 39.—*I am the Lord, and THERE IS NONE ELSE*. Isaiah xlv. 5.—*I am God, and THERE IS NONE LIKE ME*. Isaiah xlv. 9. We know where, in the New Testament, it is affirmed, *THERE IS NONE OTHER GOD BUT ONE*. 1 Cor. viii. 4.—*And that THERE IS BUT ONE GOD THE FATHER*. 1 Cor. viii. 6.—Upon these passages then, we ground our belief. It is because it is thus repeatedly declared in the Scriptures that there is *one God*, that there is *but one God*, that there is *but one God the Father*, that we receive it as a sacred and momentous truth; and it is because it is never affirmed in the Scriptures, that there are three persons in one God, that we do not believe it, because, not being sanctioned by the only authority to which we bow.

If there be any meaning in human language, if there be any authority in the commands of Jesus Christ, or any force in his example, then it is a certain truth, that Jehovah alone; that God the Father, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the *ONLY* proper object of religious worship.

Our Lord himself solemnly declares, that the *true worshippers* are those who worship the *FATHER* in *spirit and in truth*, and that the *Father seeketh such to worship him*. Were there no other passage in the whole Bible, which authorizes the Unitarians to restrict their worship to the Father only, this would be abundantly sufficient. Nay, it most authoritatively and solemnly commands them, if they would be considered true worshippers, to pay their adoration to no other person or being. By what fatality does it happen, that serious inquiring Christians never think of this passage; or if they do think of it, by what means do they evade its force? What sense do they affix to it? If those are the true worshippers who worship the Father, how can they be so who worship two other beings besides the Father? Those who worship the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, are never in the Scriptures said to be the true worshippers. Those who worship the Father only, are. The worshipper of one God, in one person, has, therefore, the express and solemn declaration of Jesus Christ, that he is the true worshipper. All other persons whatso-

ever, are destitute of this high and decisive authority?

But there are many other passages which bear directly upon this subject, that are equally striking and authoritative. Such is the Lord's Prayer itself, given by Jesus Christ, for the very purpose of teaching his disciples how to pray. The occasion to which we owe this model of authorized and acceptable worship, is so peculiar, and makes so directly in favour of the worshipper of one God in one person, that had he had the framing of circumstances which should for ever decide the matter as he wished it, by the highest authority and in the most perfect manner, it is impossible to conceive how he could have caused any others to happen, which would have been so conclusive. The disciples of our Lord, as if apprehensive that they might not have been in the habit of praying aright, or, believing that their divine Master might pour some fresh light upon their minds; or convinced that he would graciously remove their errors if they were wrong, and establish them in the truth if they were right, with humility and earnestness, asked his counsel and direction. They appear, too, to have been deeply and solemnly impressed with his own manner of addressing the universal Parent; and they were convinced that no one was so well qualified to instruct them in the proper performance of this most important duty. *And it came to pass, says the sacred historian, that as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples; and he said unto them, When ye pray, say, OUR FATHER who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, for THINE is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever, Amen.*

Now, I not only say, that Christians have a right to regulate their worship according to this perfect pattern of prayer, but I affirm, that it is their solemn and indispensable duty to do so. If ever the commands of Jesus Christ were authoritative, if ever his directions were complete, they must be conceived to be so in this instance;—for it regards an act the most important upon which he could convey instruction, and the most intimately connected with the great object of his mission. If however the general practice of Christians in the present day be right, this example of prayer, instead of being a perfect pattern of it, is exceedingly defective. It directs the mind to one object, one person, one being alone; and to this one object, person, or being, it gives the name of FATHER. This, therefore, was a most direct and complete confirmation of the great peculiarity of the Unitarian doctrine.

It was a most direct and complete confirmation of the general practice of our Lord's disciples, who, in common with all Jews, were in the habit of praying to one God in one person; for, that the Jews were acquainted with the doctrine of the Trinity, and that they paid their adorations to a Triune God, no one pretends to believe, since the doctrine is always spoken of as one of the peculiarities of the Christian system.

Here then are a number of persons, who had always been in the habit of praying to one God, in one

person, assembled round a being, who was come into the world on purpose to instruct them in every thing that concerns the Deity. According to the common notion, they had been in the habit of believing a great error, and of acting exceedingly wrong; for, if it be proper to worship the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three equal persons in one undivided essence, the worship of one of these persons, of the Father only, must be a great error. With the earnestness of sincerity, they beseech their divine instructor to open their minds to the perception of the truth; and indeed, to enlighten them on this very subject, was one great object of his coming into the world. What then does he do in answer to their request? Does he avail himself of this opportunity to remove their error? Does he tell them that they have done well to ask him, for that they have all along been addressing their adorations not to the proper object of worship, but to only a part of that object? Does he say, "You have been in the habit of praying to the Father only? This is wrong, for there are three equal persons in the Godhead, who demand alike the homage of your hearts. There are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; it is your duty to worship each." Does he command them, when ye pray, say,—“O God the Father of Heaven, have mercy upon us—O God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us—O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have mercy upon us—O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons in one God, have mercy upon us?” Does he enjoin them to urge their petitions by such pleas as the following,—“By the mystery of thy holy incarnation; by thy holy nativity and circumcision; by thy baptism, fasting, and temptation; by thy agony and bloody sweat; by thy cross and passion; by thy precious death and burial; by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost?” We know who has commanded us thus to pray, but we know that it is not Jesus Christ. Happily, his own words are placed upon record, and they are: When ye pray, say, “Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, *thine* is the kingdom,” &c. We follow his direction; we conceive that we are bound to do so; we think that we are likely to be led into misconception in opinion, and error in practice, by following any other guide; and because this is our belief, and because we act in conformity to it, we are denounced as heretics.

Is it possible that, if Jesus Christ knew that it was proper and necessary for his disciples to pray to three Persons in one God, and that to teach them this was one great object for which he came into the world, he would never tell them so; would allow such an opportunity as the present to escape, without disclosing to them this momentous truth, and would never, that we know of, avail himself of any other occasion to do so? Even supposing what can never be proved, that his disciples were already fully instructed in the doctrine of the Trinity, it is evident that they were not satisfied with regard to the manner in which they ought to worship it. They

were, at least, not sure that they ought to say, "O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons in one God." They had never been in the habit of using such a formulary; and they were not yet convinced that it was their duty to do so. They apply, therefore, to their Master for instruction, and instead of directing them to pray after this new mode, he commands them to employ the language to which they had always been accustomed; for every person knows that the words of the Lord's Prayer are a selection from the liturgy in common use among the Jews in the days of our Lord.

So that, even supposing the doctrine of the Trinity to be true, and that Jesus Christ had distinctly disclosed it to his disciples, of which, however, there is not the shadow of authority, it ought to make no alteration in our addresses to the Deity; for it is still our duty to pray to the Father, and unless any one will say that the directions of Jesus Christ are defective, to the Father only. The Father is not the Son, nor the Holy Ghost; neither are the Holy Ghost and the Son the Father. The term Father is never supposed to comprehend in it the Son and the Holy Ghost; it is always applied to the first Person in the Trinity, and to him alone. Certain, therefore, it is, that Jesus Christ commands his disciples to pray to one God in one Person; for even admitting, that there are three Persons in the Godhead, Jesus Christ leaves out two of them, and directs us to pray to one only. We have then his positive and express command to pray to the Father; we have not his positive and express command to pray to the Son and the Holy Ghost. How seriously ought every conscientious Christian to consider this!

When the disciples of our Lord, perceiving that he was in the daily habit of praying to the Father, and to no other person or being; when this was the practice to which they themselves were always accustomed; when they expressly asked him if this practice were right, and he assured them that it was, by directing them to continue the use of the common language, could they possibly believe that they were to worship two other persons besides the one invoked in the form prescribed? Could they conceive that Jesus Christ himself was one of those other persons? He whose most humble and devout addresses to the Father they so often witnessed, could they imagine that this very being was the Father, or an essential part of the Father? If so, to whom could they suppose his devotions were addressed? Could they imagine it was God praying to God; or were they aware that it was his human addressing his divine nature? Suppose this to be true, could the discovery of this most extraordinary fact beam upon their minds without an overwhelming amazement? When first the conviction of it entered their minds, must it not have absorbed all their faculties in astonishment and awe? When they came to discover that a Being who had every appearance and property of a man; with whom they had always associated as such; whom they had seen hungry and athirst; whose weary steps, as he travelled from place to place on the business of benevolence, they had often accompanied; whose slumbers they had watched,

and to the wants of whose nature they had often ministered; when they came to discover that this being was not what he appeared, and what they had hitherto supposed; that he was not a man, but the self-existent and immortal God,—what a moment must that have been! What amazement, what awe must have seized them! With what sensations must they ever after have contemplated him! With what reverence must they have approached him! When in future they saw him kneeling down to pray; when they watched him wrapped in devotion,—how must they have looked one upon the other! How must that extraordinary situation, for that most extraordinary Being, have impressed their minds! Is it possible that it should never have caused a single expression of surprise to escape them? Or, that, when they were commissioned by this wonderful personage to disclose these astonishing facts to the world, they should never speak of the error into which they at first fell; of the manner in which it was removed; of the sensations that overwhelmed them on the discovery of the stupendous truth; that, on the contrary, they should continue to speak to him, and of him, as if none of these things had ever happened; that they should represent him in all manner of situations but that one which must have been infinitely more memorable and interesting to them than any other, and should give him all manner of high and dignified appellations but that one which is most exalted of all, and the most descriptive of his nature? The term God-man, essential to the hypothesis that Jesus Christ possesses a human and divine nature, was invented as soon as this doctrine was conceived; but being altogether absent from the minds of the writers of the New Testament, the term which is descriptive of it, is nowhere to be found in the records of his life and doctrine.

What is it renders any body of Christians worthy of the esteem and friendship of their brethren? Is it an invariable and close adherence to the Scriptures? Unitarians contend, that they can not only express every peculiarity of their faith in the very words of Scripture, but that there are no other words by which they can express them with so much precision and energy. Are they asked concerning their faith in God? They answer in the words of Paul, "To us there is but one God, the Father." Are they questioned concerning his nature? They reply in the words of John, "God is love." Are they asked concerning their belief in Christ? They answer with Peter, "Jesus of Nazareth is a man approved of God by signs and wonders, which God did by him." Are they questioned concerning his office? They say with Paul, "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." But what other sect is there that can thus express the peculiarities of their faith in the language of Scripture? Where do the Trinitarians find their favourite phrases, Trinity, Triune God, incarnate God, God-man?

These are some of the considerations which weigh upon the minds of Unitarians, which they can remove by no effort, and to which they call the serious and solemn attention of their fellow-christians.

CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCE.

If mankind would take the trouble to inquire into the causes of the state of affairs in the religious world at the present, and during past ages, back to the time of our Saviour's appearance on earth, and aid their investigation by a comparison of the effects of the same cause, much of the dissention and uncertainty, as well as impositions of the present day in which we live, would be done away. But, so long as the public receive the current of their opinions, and the prominent features of their religious creed, as well as their *charitable feelings* from a *pampered clergy*, so long they will be hoodwinked, and their hands turned every man against his fellow. It is a remarkable, and a lamentable fact, too, that men generally do not use their reason in theological questions, as they are wont to do in secular concerns; but give and expect a blind assent to errors sanctioned only by time and custom, and the obstinacy and impudence of those who advocate them, and whose worldly interest is predicated on their popularity and continuance. Not to fatigue the reader with general remarks, however true and obvious, we point at once to facts, and let reason and common sense judge of the whole matter. It is so certain as to be admitted as an axiom, that *the same causes will produce the same effects*. Go back to the Pharisees of Christ's day, and their compeers in pretension and *holy arrogance*, and consider the effects of the spirit which dwelt in their bosoms, and dictated and governed their conduct. Ask—Who were most honourable, most popular, and most esteemed by the world, or the majority, at that time? You must answer—The *Pharisees*. Who were despised and treated with contumely and slanderous invective, above all others? Answer—The believers in, and followers of, the meek and lowly Jesus. What is the present state of affairs? Will the same causes produce the same effects? Most certainly. We ask—Who now are despised and rejected of the world, the majority? Who are considered above all others, as the *offscourings* of the earth? Who can say with the persecuted Paul, "For we both labour and *suffer reproach*, because we *trust* in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all* men, especially of those that believe?" We believe the reader must say, The sect called Universalists, *suffer more reproach*, than all the rest of mankind put together. Why this reproach; this obloquy; this contumely? The answer is always the same, "For we both *labour and suffer reproach*, because we *trust* in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all* men, especially of them that believe." Let a man *trust* in a decree of election, graduated on Calvin's or Hopkins's scale, or on the *works* of the creature, according to the Arminian creed, and he will suffer *little reproach*, if any. Let a man trust in a god who is the saviour of *some* men, of a *part*, of a *few* of mankind, and his labour is lightened by the complacent smile of a multitude of Pharisees. The sun, when he blazes in his meridian glory, diffusing his cheering beams in noon-day splendour, is not more apparent than the conclusions which flow from these glaring premises.

We reiterate the truth. It blazes around us, and its coruscations shoot in dazzling brilliancy, and lightens to the very foundation of the fabric of murky error. We view the prototypes of modern Pharisees, and the modern Pharisees at a single glance. Their cause is one. The same spirit, and the same motives are identified as the same causes, producing the same effects. "The world loves its own." Its voice is raised to cover the heads of its favourites with the putrid canopy of reproach and slander, and shield them in corruption's cankered fortress. O ye sages of primitive reproach, chastened amid the invective of polished saints and worldlings, and rejected with the Master and High Priest of your profession, how would the thunder of your eloquence echo in the splendid palaces and pampered abodes of modern corruption! What would be your holy indignation on viewing the gluttoned pre-eminence of wolves in your own clothing, preying sanctimoniously upon the vitals of charity, and sanctioning all their pretensions and possessions, by a reference to their conformity with your principles and practices!

EXTRACT.

"When I was in Italy," says a modern traveller, "a priest was preaching about a poor sinner who had departed this life. His soul appeared before God, and was required to give an account of all his actions. The evil and the good were afterwards thrown into opposite scales, in order to see which preponderated. That containing the good proved much the lightest, and instantly flew up to the beam. His poor soul was condemned to the infernal regions, conducted by angels to the bottomless pit, delivered over to devils, and thrown into flames. 'Already,' said the preacher, 'had the devouring element covered his feet and legs, and proceeded upwards even unto his bowels; in his vitals, oh! brethren, he felt them. He sunk, and only his head appeared above the waves of fire, when he cried out to God and afterwards to his patron saint. 'Oh! patron!' said he, 'look down upon me; oh! take compassion upon me, and throw into the scale of my good deeds, all the lime and stone which I gave to repair the convent of——.' His saint instantly took the hint; gathered together all the lime and stone, threw them into the scale of good, which immediately preponderated; the scale of evil immediately sprung up to the beam, and the sinner's soul into paradise at the same moment. Now you see by this, brethren, how useful it is to keep the convents in repair; for had it not been for the lime and stone bestowed by this sinner, his poor soul would even now, children, be consuming in hell fire; and yet you are so blind as to let the convent and the church, built by your forefathers, fall to ruin." "At this time," continues the author, "these people wanted to get a new convent built, and had recourse to this expedient to procure money, which after this, poured in upon them from all quarters."

REMARKS.

Now, reader, we know you will laugh at this story, and call it a wicked and foolish invention of one man to deceive others; and yet you know that

had any of the hearers of this discourse *dared* to ask the priest where he obtained these particulars, he would instantly have been called a "*Heretic*," "*Infidel*," &c. and perhaps he would have been *burned* for denying religion!—Such is the force of superstition, that its effects upon the human mind are scarcely to be equalled by any other power. How striking the similarity between this preacher's harangue, and those which we frequently hear among ourselves, from the advocates of missions! These preachers tell us, that people, perhaps in India, or in the western woods, are "sinking into hell (we quote their own words) every hour, because they have no preaching;" and the moment you ask the speaker for his proof, or how he knows his story is true, he raises the cry "*Infidel*! you blaspheme in thus prying into God's secrets," &c. This sometimes has the effect to secure the man from these interrogations; for, as we said before, superstition is not easily overcome, and a man that is cursed by it, has awful ideas of the effects of anathemas. Can any thing be more ridiculous than these things? If so, we wish some one would take the trouble to inform us *what*, for really we know of nothing that can even compare with them. *Plain Truth.*

THE RESURRECTION.

"Death held his sceptre over the Son of God; till the third day began to dawn upon the world; when on a sudden the earth trembled to its centre, and the powers of heaven were shaken. But who is this that cometh forth from the tomb—with dyed garments from the bed of death? It is thy Prince, O Zion—Nations of the earth, it is your Lord. He hath trodden the wine press alone; but now he arises a conqueror from the grave, and brings salvation to the sons of men. The Father of Mercies looked down from his throne in the heavens; with complacency he beheld his world restored—he saw his work that it was good. Then did the desert rejoice; the face of nature was gladdened before him, when the blessings of the Eternal descended as the dew of heaven for the refreshing of the nations."

A NEW ARTICLE OF DIET.

We learn that clergymen are in the practice of sometimes visiting the sick who are *poor*, and leaving with them a *Tract* or two! Would it not be more beneficial to the sick, who are destitute of the *necessaries*, to say nothing of the comforts of life, to furnish them something for the *suffering body*? This wonderful anxiety for the *soul*, and shameful neglect of the *body*, which can be benefited immediately, speaks volumes!

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

The controversy between Mr. Woodworth, editor of the "*New-Jerusalem Missionary*," and the editor of this paper, is assuming a curious aspect. Our only motive, we trust, is to elicit truth, and to expose error. We court no laurels or reward, and we fear no reproach, and dread no loss. We shall therefore go straight forward; occasionally expressing our pity for Mr. W., and lamenting his way-

wardness. His readers, we hope, at least a majority of them, have better judgment than their editor, and will discover his mistakes and incongruities. We have carefully avoided every mode of expression which could irritate, or be a sufficient cause of displeasure. We shall continue this course, and Mr. W.'s readers will account for any extraordinary excitements he may occasionally labour under. We hope he will continually remember his high responsibility, and the dignity of his avocations; being, as he avers, a *co-worker*, or *co-operating* with the blessed God. Now, if Mr. W. manifests a spirit different from God's Spirit, we shall be more inclined to doubt the *alliance*. The following is from Mr. W.'s Number for September. In our next, we shall introduce his Reply contained in his Number for October.

"UNIVERSALISM.

"We have a 'long account to settle' with the gentlemen of this denomination; but as their 'bills were not presented' until we had made such arrangements for the present number of the '*Missionary*' as left but little space unoccupied, we are compelled to defer our replies to Mr. Fitz, and others, until next month. In the mean time, however, we must 'force an opening,' in this page, to do away an erroneous impression which may be received from reading the *first sentence* of Mr. Fitz's reply, in the

"GOSPEL HERALD.

"After quoting our remarks, as published in this Magazine for last month, page 113, Mr. Fitz commences his reply in the following words:

"Mr. Woodworth has very ingeniously *evaded* answering our questions, and politely mistaken about the whole of our argument."

"Now let the public judge whether we have *evaded* answering the questions proposed by Mr. F. or not. Here follow his *questions*, and our *answers*, copied *verbatim* from the *Missionary* :

"*Question.* 'Now we would wish to ask, whether Mr. W. would like to admit that God's mercy is *finite*?'"

"*Answer.* 'So far from admitting "that God's mercy is *finite*," we say it is *infinite*, and extends even to the hells.' p. 117.

"*Question.* 'That a sufficient reason *cannot* be given to satisfy a being who is *perfect* in mercy, for the permission of the present state of affairs?'"

"*Answer.* 'We know that "a sufficient reason can be given for the permission of the present state of affairs;" but Mr. F. has not assigned the right one; and we suspected that he could not, without impugning his own doctrines.' p. 117.

"*Question.* 'Is the God you worship *able* to save mankind, and to make them holy and happy?'"

"*Answer.* 'We have attempted to prove that man *cannot* be saved, or made holy and happy *against his own will*.' p. 167. 'If man says, "Evil, be thou my good," God cannot prevent him without first depriving him of all that constitutes him a human being,' [viz. *freedom of will*.] p. 116.

"*Question.* 'When and before God created man, in the aggregate or an individual, did your God *know* the consequence to man, individually, and in

the aggregate, whom he was about to create, of creating him?"

"Answer. 'With the great I AM, the past, present, and future, form *one eternal NOW*, on which fore-knowledge cannot be predicated.' p. 117.

"Question. 'Had your God a *design*, extending to the final destiny of every man, when he created him? Was that design the *good* or *ill* of the creature?'

"Answer. 'He created man, and peopled all the worlds of the universe, for the purpose of imparting to other beings, from the inexhaustible fund of his own infinite felicity.' The end of creation was the eternal happiness of the creature; and every thing in the universe was intended [*designed*] solely for the promotion of that end. Hence man was endowed with *freedom of will*, in order that he might be capable of conjoining himself to his Creator by regeneration, and thereby become receptive of heavenly felicity. Being a free agent, man had the power of turning to God, or turning from him. He exercised this power, turned from the only fountain of spiritual life, was no longer receptive of felicity, and was consequently miserable. This state continued until man had nearly lost the freedom of his will, and the power of returning to God. From this dreadful condition, however, God redeemed him, by coming in the flesh, and conquering the hells, which (with man's consent,) had shackled his mind, and held his will in bondage. Since that period every man has full power to turn to God and live. Some exercise this power—others do not—all are free to act as they please.' p. 117.

"Question. 'Is your future hell a place of correction for the *reformation* of the sinner, or a place of endless torment?'

"Answer. 'We have shown that hell is not a place, but a *state*, adapted to the disposition [or ruling love] of its subjects.' p. 117.

"Question. 'If your God *knew* that man would be tormented endlessly, did he not make him for that express purpose? If he made him for this purpose, is not your God *cruel*?'

"Answer. 'God did not *design* any man for this *state*, and consequently cannot be charged with cruelty.' p. 117. 'Every soul enters into the *state* of his own choice—every one voluntarily conjoins himself to a society, whose desires and thoughts are in exact agreement with his own.' p. 115. After death 'each one enters into the joy of his lord, (his ruling affection,) whether it be God or Mammon. He who feels unhappy in the society of the godly *here*, would be still more unhappy in such society *there*. Consequently the existence of that *state* (not *place*) which the Scriptures call *hell*, is an eternal evidence of the mercy of God; for thousands would be infinitely more unhappy without it.' p. 116.

"Question. 'If he made him for another purpose, and he did not answer the purpose intended, is he not ignorant and impotent?'

"Answer. 'He made him free to stand or fall, and cannot, therefore, be either *ignorant* or *impotent*.' p. 117.

"Such were our answers to the questions proposed by Mr. F., and yet he says, that we have 'ingeniously *evaded* answering' them. Surely could not have read our remarks with that attention which the *subject* merits, however feeble the remarks may be in themselves.

"In our next number he shall hear from us again, when we hope to prove that he has 'politely mistaken the meaning' of the Apostle, who speaks of our being 'changed in the twinkling of an eye.' A change of the *heart* is not here alluded to, for the language of the whole Bible tends to show that a change from sin to holiness, is always a *progressive* and *gradual* work, which can never be effected without man's *co-operation*. 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.' 'For we are labourers together with God.' 'Wash you, make you clean; cease to do evil; learn to do well.' If this be not *co-operation* on the part of man, in producing that change which renders the soul susceptible of heavenly happiness, we are ignorant of the meaning of the word. And what is the result of this *co-operation*? 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'"

REMARKS.

We have published the whole of Mr. W.'s introduction to his "*long account*," to prevent a possibility of misconstruction relative to our motives. Not to fatigue the reader, we would only observe, that Mr. W. has shifted the arrangement of the following.—We ask, "whether Mr. W. would like to admit that God's mercy is *finite*? That a sufficient reason cannot be given to satisfy a being who is perfect in mercy, for the present state of affairs?" Mr. W. acknowledges God's mercy to be infinite; and says—"We know that a sufficient reason can be given," &c. Now, the reason we assign is, that man may be raised immortal, incorruptible, and glorious; and be made the recipient of God's perfections, which will ensure and perpetuate his happiness. If Mr. W. can assign a better one, we shall be glad to receive it.

Our question, whether "God is *able* to save mankind," &c. appears to be answered in the *negative*. Will Mr. W. be consistent, and add that it would imply a contradiction to say, God is *able* to save mankind?

Our question, whether "God *knew* the consequence to man," &c. also appears to be answered in the *negative*. Would it also imply a contradiction, to say, God knew "the consequence to man, individually," &c. Because a poet, availing himself of the license which is granted by *courtesy*, declared, that

"One eternal now doth always last!"

Are the flighty vagaries, and strange imaginations of uninspired men, to be received as authority, because their assertions *rhyme*, in opposition to the voice of *inspiration*, which declares, "*Known* unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world;" (Acts xv. 18.) "*I am* God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning?" (Isa. xlv. 10.) There is none like the true

God. Mr. W.'s God *cannot* save; and is so ignorant as not to know any thing but the *present*!

Mr. W. is consistent in saying God did not *design* any man for *hell*. Surely, a being who only knows the present, and is not able to effect his purposes, (if he has any) without *man's* assistance, cannot be supposed to design any thing with *certainty*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—In a late Number you published remarks on a Sermon delivered at Morristown, (N. J.) by the Rev. Mr. Brownley, of Basking-Ridge, at the request of a Watchman. As I heard the Rev. Gentleman, I should be pleased to see your remarks on his *arguments*, instead of Dr. Clarke's Commentaries, as it is presumed Mr. B. does not agree with Dr. C. It is also presumed Mr. B. will give a copy of his Sermon, if requested. Yours, &c.

A HEARER.

Morristown, (N. J.) Oct. 1822.

Note. It is time for us to notice Mr. B.'s *arguments* when we know them. At present we can only conjecture. If the Rev. Gentleman will favour us with a copy of his objections to the doctrine we advocate, we will then examine them. ED.

NATURE OF SAVING GRACE.

We recollect having read an essay on the "*Nature of saving Grace*." We have for some time past been of the opinion that religionists use mottoes without regard to the meaning of words; and selecting a sentence, go on pell mell in absurdity. Reader, what is the *nature* of *poisonous* arsenic? Is it not to *poison*? What is the *nature* of *saving* grace? Is it not to *save*? When we say, "God be *gracious*;" we must mean this—God be *favourable*; for the Scripture use of the term, is *favour*. Therefore, God is either gracious, or ungracious to mankind. That is, favourable or unfavourable. The Scriptures assure us, that "in His *favour* is *life*." Is God "good to all?" Are His "*tender mercies* over all His works?" What is *grace*, or *favour*, but *goodness*, and *tender mercy*? And this for ALL! Reader, God's grace or favour is sufficient for thee, for thine, for all mankind. Believe, confide, rejoice for evermore.

From a London Paper.

The following beautiful stanzas, by Mr. Bowring, are from a small volume just published, entitled "*Matins and Vespers*."

SISTE VIATOR!

Look around thee! See decay
On her wings of darkness, sweeping
Earth's proud monuments away;
See the Muse of History weeping
O'er the ruins Time hath made;
Strength in dust and ashes laid—
Virtue in oblivion sleeping.

Look around thee! Wisdom there
Careless Death confounds with Folly,
In a common sepulchre!
See the unrighteous and the holy,
Blended in the general wreck.
Well those tears may wet thy cheek—
Tears of doubt and melancholy.

Look around thee! Beauty's light
Is extinguished; Death assembles
Youth's gay morn, and Age's night—
And the steadfast mountain trembles
At his glance, like Autumn's leaf:
All, he cries, is vain—is brief—
And the tyrant ne'er dissembles.

Look behind thee! Cities hid
In the night of treacherous story;
Many a crumbling pyramid,
Many a pile of senseless glory,
Temples into ruin hurl'd,
(Fragments of an earlier world,)
Broken fanes, and altars hoary.

Look behind thee! Men whose frown
Made whole nations quake before them—
What is left of their renown?—
Wrecks around, oblivion o'er them.
Kings and conquerors!—where are they?—
Ask yon worthless heaps of clay.
Oh, despise not, but deplore them!

Look behind thee! Bards sublime,
Smiling nymphs, and solemn sages—
Go! inquire their names of Time;
Bid it read its earliest pages.
Foolish questioner! If Fame
Guard through years a cherished name—
Fame itself decays in ages.

Look before thee! All the glare,
All the pomp around thee glowing,
All that charms the eye or ear,
Strains of softest music flowing,
Grace and Beauty—all are sped
Towards the ruins of the dead—
Thither thou and thine are going.

Look before thee! At yon vault,
Where Time's ravage is recorded,
Thou wilt be compelled to halt;
Thou wilt be no more regarded
Than the meekest, meanest slave,
Sleeping in a common grave,
Unrespected—unrewarded.

Look before thee! At thy feet
Monarchs sleep like meaner creatures;
Where the voices, now so sweet?
Where the fair ones' smiling features?
Hopedst thou to escape the tomb?
That which was thy father's doom,
Will be thine, thy son's, and nature's!

Look above thee! There indeed
May thy thoughts repose delighted.
If thy wounded bosom bleed,
If thy fondest hopes are blighted;
There a stream of comfort flows,
There a sun of splendor glows:
Wander, then, no more benighted.

Look above thee! Ages roll,
Present, past, and future blending—
Earth hath nought to soothe a soul
Neath affliction's burden bending,
Nothing 'gainst the tempest's shock;
Heaven must be the pilgrim's rock,
And to Heaven his steps are tending.

Look above thee! Never eye
Saw such pleasures as await thee!
Thought ne'er reached such scenes of joy
As are there prepared to meet thee:
Light undying—seraphs' lyres—
Angel welcomes—cherub choirs
Smiling through Heaven's doors to greet thee.

"PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will in future meet on TUESDAY Evenings, at half-past six o'clock, at Mr. Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street. Christians of every sect are invited to attend.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1823.

NO. 27.

NEW-JERUSALEM MISSIONARY.

Agreeably to a promise given in our last, we now commence the insertion of Mr. Woodworth's reply to our remarks, &c.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

"In our last number we disposed of Mr. Fitz's first paragraph, by showing that we *did* answer each of the questions which he proposed, notwithstanding his repeated assertions to the contrary. We shall now proceed, as was then proposed, to prove that the *instantaneous change*, alluded to by Mr. F., in his second paragraph, is not a change of man's moral character, but only of his mode of existence.

"In the fifteenth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle endeavours to do away the absurd idea which many of the early converts to Christianity entertained, that the *material body* would be raised from the grave at some future period, be re-united to the soul, and inherit the kingdom of God. He, therefore, assures them, *emphatically*, that the material body, which is committed to the earth, 'is not that body which shall be;' that 'there is a *natural body*, and there is a *spiritual body*;' and that flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God.' He then proceeds to remove from their minds that fallacious idea, (which was previously entertained, also, by Martha, the sister of Mary,) that we shall 'all sleep' in the grave, until 'the resurrection at the last day.' He assures his Corinthian brethren that 'we shall *not* all sleep; but we shall all be *changed* in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, (for the trumpet shall sound,) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.' As if he had said, 'As soon as we are separated from the corruptible material body, that moment, "in the twinkling of an eye," we shall find ourselves in the eternal world, clothed in spiritual bodies, which are immortal and incorruptible. To us, who 'have fought the good fight,' and who 'know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren; to us the death of the material body gives no terrors—to us the tyrant has no sting, the grave no victory—for 'we shall not all sleep' in the dust, 'but we shall all be *changed* in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye'—to us the summons of death is but the last trump of an archangel calling us to the glorious realities of an eternal life in heaven. We obeyed the call of the first trumpet, which awoke us to repentance, and led us on to a complete victory over our spiritual enemies; why, then, should we fear the last trumpet, which invites us to the sweet reward of all our labours? 'Flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God.' Let us then part willingly with our corrupti-

ble bodies, and put on *incorruption*; let us cheerfully relinquish this state of *mortality*, and put on *immortality*. Thus will death be 'swallowed up in victory.' 'O death! where is thy sting! O grave! where is thy victory! The sting of death is sin,' but thanks be to God, we have obtained a complete victory over sin, through the assistance of redeeming grace. 'Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.' So says the great apostle of the Gentiles; but what says our modern apostle of the Universalists respecting the efficacy of man's labour and works? Take his own words: 'Man can do nothing! HALLELUJAH!'

"From what has been said above, it will be seen that the *immortality* and the *incorruption* spoken of by Paul, is 'put on' by every soul, in the same moment that it leaves the mortal, material, and corruptible body. The righteous and the wicked, in this single instance, are alike; for an *immortal* state of existence awaits them both. This seemed like a *mystery* to the young converts of Corinth, who had been educated in a very different belief. They looked forward to death as a state of indeterminate and unconscious sleep. They knew not that the soul was the real man, and that the material body was merely an adjunct or covering to enable it to act during its period of probation in a material world. They concluded, therefore, that when the body fell asleep all the powers and faculties of the human mind must fall asleep with it, and remain in that cheerless state until awakened by the last trumpet, at the end of the world. This was giving a victory to the grave which it can never claim; and in order to remove such gloomy ideas from their minds, the apostle assures them that so far from sleeping some thousands of years in the earth, 'we shall all be *changed*' at the moment of death, and become *immortal* and *incorruptible*.

"In his third paragraph, Mr. F. requests us to show how man is to 'labour jointly' with God, in effecting a change in his own moral character. We are sorry to receive such a request from Mr. F. inasmuch as it implies a want of that mental experience which we hoped was familiar to every follower of Christ. But, as it is a question of vital importance, it shall receive the best answer of which we are capable.

"The first duty to be discharged by man in co-operating with God to produce that moral change which all must experience in *this world*, or be for ever miserable in the next, is the work of REPENTANCE, for this is the beginning and foundation of the

church in the human mind. By REPENTANCE we do not mean a mere regret and sorrow for having committed certain sins, but a firm and unbending resolution to abstain from all sins in future; a rigid determination to resist every corrupt propensity of the will; and, as far as in him lies, to shun evils, both in thought and act, *as sins against God*. To shun them from any other *motive* than this, (viz. because they are sins against God) is not genuine repentance. The Lord *loves all men*, but he cannot *conjoin* himself with any so long as they love and practise evil; and without *conjunction* with him there can be no happiness for the creature. Every one, therefore, who wishes to be *conjoined* to the Lord, which is but another word for *regeneration and salvation*, must first do the work of repentance; examine his own heart, search out and discover all its latent propensities to evil, fight against them by faithfully practising the contrary virtues; always remembering and acknowledging, with humility and gratitude, that the power to do all this is *continually* given him from on high. All the precepts of the gospel unite in urging us to commence this indispensable duty; all the exhortations of the Bible, from the beginning to end, may be summed up in a few short sentences like the following: 'Repent, ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Again, 'Repent, and be converted.' And, again, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.' Let this great work of REPENTANCE be commenced with sincerity and earnestness, and it will soon lead to a state of REFORMATION, which will finally terminate in REGENERATION, when the faithful labourer will begin to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind, and his neighbour as himself, and thus keep all the commandments, fulfil all the law and the prophets, 'for love is the fulfilling of the law.' But no man can thus fulfil the law until he has first passed through the states above mentioned; because, until then, he cannot love his brother as himself. The apostle makes this love of our neighbour the *test* by which we may know when we *have* passed through those states. He says, 'we know that we have passed from death unto life, *because we love the brethren*.' And if we cannot then love our *neighbour* until we have passed these states of REPENTANCE and REFORMATION, how much less can we love God above all things! for, 'if a man say, 'I love God,' and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?'

"In compliance with Mr. Fitz's request, we have thus, very briefly, shown 'how man can co-operate with God,' in producing a change in his own moral character. He must examine his own heart, search out and discover its latent evils, and manfully fight against them, by faithfully practising the opposite virtues. 'Cease to do evil—learn to do well.' But Mr. F. seems to think that this is taking too much trouble, and has, therefore, persuaded himself and others, that the work here pointed out is neither necessary nor practicable. Alas, Sir, let me intreat you

'Lay not this flattering unction to your soul.'

Mr. F. seems to think that man's REPENTANCE would be a '*wondrous thing*,' and with great self-complacency exclaims, as he wraps up his Lord's pound in a napkin, 'Triumphant truth! GOD ALONE does *wondrous things*! Man can do *nothing*! HALLELUJAH!'

"In Mr. F.'s third paragraph, he objects to our doctrine of *co-operation*, on the ground that man is merely 'the humble recipient of God's goodness.' So he is. It is an eternal truth, that the soul of man is merely a recipient vessel, prepared to receive life and light, goodness and truth, from the Lord. But what then? Is he not imperiously and continually required to *return* these gifts back to God, with interest, in the fruits of righteous—in a life of virtue and usefulness? Is not a ploughed field a *recipient* of the sower's seed? and has the earth no *agency* in producing the expected fruits? Let the Lord's own words answer this question, where he compares the kingdom of God, in the soul, to the process of natural vegetation. 'For the *earth* (says he) *bringeth forth fruit of herself*: first the blade, then the ear; after that, the full corn in the ear.' The comparison would be absurd if man did not, like the earth, bring forth fruits of himself, after the seed of divine truth has been sown in his heart. 'For we are labourers together with God: *ye are God's husbandry*,' and are required to 'bring forth *fruits* worthy of repentance.' But if Mr. F. had stood among the crowd to whom this last requirement was addressed, he would, doubtless, have exclaimed, 'How can *we* bring forth such fruits? Man can do *nothing*! HALLELUJAH!'"

"Mr. F. asks, 'will not man be *good* when he shall be raised in the *heavenly image*?' We answer, *Yes*; but it remains with Mr. F. to prove that *all* men are thus raised. St. Paul does not intimate such a thing. He merely says to the Corinthian converts, that '*we* shall bear the image of the heavenly,' meaning himself, and all others of the church who, like him, had 'fought the good fight' against their internal evils; and who could say with John; 'We *know* that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.'

"Again—Mr. F. inquires, in his *fourth* paragraph, 'Is not the being raised *immortal*, &c. a salvation?' Here we answer, *No*; immortality, of itself, is not salvation; for devils (grant us such beings for a moment) will live for ever, and are, of course, *immortal*. Every soul (at the *moment* of its separation from the body) will be raised to *immortality*. 'They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.' The rich man was *immortal* in hell; Lazarus was not more so in heaven. We admit that this was a parable; but we deny that the Lord would inculcate *false doctrine*, even in a parable."

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. Woodworth has undertaken to prove "that the *instantaneous change*" spoken of by Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. "is not a change of man's *moral* character, but only of his *mode* of existence." Fortunately

or himself and his neighbours, he has utterly failed in his attempt; although he stopped Paul's mouth, and gave an account of the matter more to his liking. We do not approve of rejecting so good evidence as Paul's testimony. If any of Mr. W.'s readers prefer *his* testimony, and count Paul's of little worth, we cannot help it. We appeal to all honest candid men, "to whom these presents shall come;"—we say, Friends, and brethren, you are interested in the matter now at issue. If you believe *Mr. W.* to be better authority than *Christ's* apostle Paul, we shall labour with you in vain. But, if you believe Paul's testimony, when it contradicts Mr. W.'s, then, we pray you, give good heed to the following:

Mr. Woodworth says, "Thus will death 'be swallowed up in victory,' &c. [How?] thanks be to God, *we* have obtained [*WE, ourselves, have obtained*] a complete victory over sin, through the assistance of redeeming grace." [Grace assisted, but *WE* obtained a complete victory!!!]

Christ's Apostle Paul says, "But thanks to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Reader, pause—consider yourself in the presence of the heart-searching God, and answer, Do the "words, "God giveth," mean "*WE* have obtained?" Reader, this subject is not one to be trifled with. You may conceal the convictions and sentiments of your heart from man, and speak for a party; but, remember, *Truth* will prevail, and "all that are incensed shall be ashamed."

What does Paul mean, when he says, (2 Cor. v. 18.) "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ?" Does Paul mean that a part is of God? That *we* reconcile ourselves? That "*we* have obtained a complete victory?" We pity the man, whose head and heart is so waywardly bent on perversion of the testimony of God's inspired servants. Mr. W., as is common to those in error, mistakes the time of the victory. He says, "To us who 'have fought the good fight,' and who 'know that *we* have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren,' to us the death of the material body gives no terrors—to us the tyrant has no sting, the grave no victory," &c. But Paul says, "When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then [not before,] shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory," &c. The case seems to be this: Mr. W. can obtain, in his own time, that, which Paul receives as the gift of God, when God raises him immortal.

There are two modes of commenting on the Scriptures. One is to explain the meaning of the sacred writers; the other, to give our own sentiments and opinions, and palm them upon the world for the sentiments and opinions of others. Mr. W. has substituted in the stead of Paul's words, his own, as follows—"To us [we pious good folks,] the summons of death is but the last trump of an archangel," &c. Now we think, that Paul, if he intended to convey an idea of this kind, was as well

qualified as Mr. W. to find a suitable mode of expression! According to Mr. W. the summons of death, and the last trump of the arch-angel are one and the same. He also makes Paul speak (or rather speaks for him,) of a first trump! Mr. W. having disposed of Paul, concludes his paragraph, exultingly, saying, "*Man* can do nothing," &c. Pray, Sir, taking Paul's testimony, (not your own,) what has man done? Answer, Mr. W. "*WE* have obtained a complete victory," &c. Answer, Paul—"Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory," &c. Now, Sir, the word "*HALLELUJAH!*" comes with emphasis!

Mr. W. in his third paragraph admits and contends, that "*every soul*" puts on immortality and incorruption on leaving the body, &c. This uproots all his favourite schemes, and leaves him in the possession of error and absurdity. For Mr. W. must bend to the authority of Scripture, reason, and a host of witnesses. Pray, Sir, what do you mean by immortality? We use the word in the proper sense, and assert it to mean, "*a life that cannot be dissolved.*" Paul is explicit, when he says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And Christ declares, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Again it is declared, of God, the Father of all—"Who only hath immortality," &c. Is it possible for mankind to be made the recipients of immortality, and remain unbelievers, ignorant of the Son of God? Is it possible for mankind to be made alive in Christ, and be ignorant of Christ, and out of Christ? To use Mr. W.'s most favourite phrase—How is it possible for mankind to be made alive in Christ, raised immortal, &c. unless they are "*conjoined to the Lord*?" By consulting Ezek. xxxvii. you will learn, that life is communicated by the Spirit of God; and, Sir, to your astonishment we presume, without man's co-operation. Mr. W. left his commentary in a very unfinished state. Not so Paul's declaration. Paul declares of the resurrection of the dead (indiscriminately,) 1 Cor. xv. 42-44. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." Mr. W. will find it difficult to prove, that raising men like "*owls, vultures, swine,*" etc. is raising them in "*glory, power,*" and with a "*spiritual body,*" incorruptible and immortal. Consider your figures, class and analyze them—Incorruptible, immortal, and glorious "*owls, vultures, and swine,*" with spiritual bodies!!! Sir, for the honour of human nature, we hope you are, by this time, ashamed of your crooked system.

Mr. W. commences his fourth paragraph, saying, "In his third paragraph, Mr. F. requests us to show how man is to 'labour jointly' with God, in effecting a change in his own moral character." He then commiserates our condition, as one of little mental experience, &c. Now we consider this in the light of an attempt to run away from our arguments, and introduce a subject for discussion encumbered with fewer difficulties. Sir, you must

go back. We cannot consent to have you walk off in this manner. We must be indulged with the privilege of making a little distinction between "man's moral character" in *this* mode of being, and the "*Heavenly image*" of another state, when he is raised "incorruptible, immortal, and glorious, made alive in Christ," &c. Now, Sir, to use your own terms, we repeat our question—whether to possess the *immortality*, &c. which is the exclusive property of the blessed God, is not to be "*conjoined* to the Lord?" Can a man be made alive in Christ, without being "*conjoined*" to Christ? We wish to be answered—Will you show, *how* man is to "labour jointly" with God, in effecting *this* change? This change from "dishonour to glory; weakness to power; a natural body to a spiritual body; corruption to incorruption; mortality to immortality; an earthly image to a heavenly image?"

Mr. W. however, taking himself "clean off," proceeds as follows—"The first duty to be discharged by man in *co-operating* with God to produce that *moral change* which all must experience in *this world*, or be for ever miserable in the next, is the work of *repentance*, for this is the beginning and foundation of the church in the human mind." Will Mr. W. please to answer—What part of the Sacred Testimony declares, that man shall be *for ever miserable* in the next world, unless he "*co-operates*" with God in this, to produce a *moral change* by a work of repentance? Now, Sir, we deny your premises altogether, and call upon you for proof. We also ask you, to prove that "the work of repentance is the beginning and *foundation* of the church in the human mind?" Paul says, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is [What? *Repentance!* No!] *Jesus Christ.*" 1 Cor. iii. 11. We read of Christ, that God hath exalted him, "a Prince and a Saviour, for to *give repentance* to Israel, and *forgiveness* of sins." Acts v. 31. Not "*We have obtained*," &c. When you give your children bread, teach them to say, "*We have obtained*" the bread, by "our joint labour, *co-operating*" with our father! Carry your theology into your family, and let your children use your phrases daily, and you will see their absurdity.

Mr. W. continues—"The Lord loves all men, but he cannot *conjoin* himself with any so long as they love and practise evil; and without *conjunction* with him there can be no happiness for the creature." We presume this is Mr. W.'s commentary on the following passages—Rom. v. 10. "For if when we were *enemies* we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, [or, according to Mr. W. our *co-operation*,] much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." Ephes. ii. 4-7. "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love where-with he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved,) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. That in the ages to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in *his* kindness towards us through Christ Jesus." We presume, by being "*enemies, and dead in sins*," Mr. W.

means *co-operating*! At all events, we cannot suppose him to deal differently with these passages, than he has done with the same Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. Mr. W. continues—"Every one, therefore, who wishes to be *conjoined* to the Lord, which is but another word for *regeneration* and *salvation*, must first do the work of repentance," &c. This may be a commentary on the following—Ephes. ii. 8, 9, 10, "For by *grace* [*co-operating*] are ye saved, through faith; and that not of *yourselves*; it is the gift of God. [Or, as Mr. W. says, "*We have obtained*," &c.] *Not of works*, lest any man should boast. [Paul, Paul, you are wrong! Mr. W. says, the man "*must first do the work of repentance!*" For we are *his workmanship* [How? Mr. W. informs us, by our labouring jointly, *co-operating*, &c. The word '*his*,' meaning '*we*,' &c.] created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." It appears from Mr. W. that *regeneration and salvation*, mean, being *conjoined* to the Lord in *this world*. We have already given our understanding of the word regeneration. We understand by salvation, in its extensive sense, all the blessings which result to man through the whole *office-work* of Christ; including the resurrection to a glorious immortality, &c. We have yet to learn, that *all fullness* dwelt in Christ, and that his mission to reconcile all unto himself, will fail for want of *man's co-operation*!

Mr. W. continues—"All the precepts of the gospel unite in urging us to commence this indispensable duty; all the exhortations of the Bible, from the beginning to the end, may be summed up in a few short sentences like the following: 'Repent, ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Again, 'Repent, and be converted.' And, again, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.' Now we do not like this disjointing of sentences, and giving only that part which favours the particular view of a party. Paul assigns a reason why the Philippians should work out their *own* salvation "with fear and trembling, for," he adds, "it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of *his good pleasure*." Now we caution our friend W. to do the same. Also to remember, that *his own* salvation, and *God's* salvation, are two things. God's salvation consists in raising man, (not by man's co-operation, but by his irresistible power,) incorruptible and immortal, in the heavenly image of his Son. We shall now offer Mr. W. a criterion, whereby he may judge of his *co-operating* with God. The exhortation concludes, saying, "It is God who worketh in you, both to will and to do of *his good pleasure*." Now, Sir, God's "*good pleasure* which he hath purposed in himself," is, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, [not in *this world*,] he might gather together in *one all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, in him." Ephes. i. 9, 10. Sir, it would be an outrage on common sense, to say, that a man is "*co-operating* with God, and willing and doing what God wills and does, when it is God's "*good pleasure* to gather together in *one all things* in Christ,"

and the man's *evil pleasure* to consign a part to be "*for ever miserable*!" Are you, Sir, co-operating with God in *Salvation*, when you consign your brethren, of the human family, to an *endless hell*? Are you not rather co-operating with the devil in *damnation*? We use plainness of speech, for the occasion demands it. You have the criterion. It is infallible. Apply it. Reader, to you, we say, If you "love your neighbour as *yourself*," you will never, in time or eternity, on earth, or in heaven, know peace or joy, if your neighbour is to be "*for ever miserable*!" The man who could repose in peace, undisturbed, while his greatest *enemy* was writhing in the torments of an *endless hell*, would be a *devil*! and better fitted for a *hell* himself, than for any other place or state which can be imagined. We urge the consideration of the following—If it is an evidence of *hatred*, to view with complacency the sufferings of another, how abominable must be the state of that man's mind, who can not only view in prospect the misery of millions, with complacency, but rejoice that it is to be interminable! Heaven, in mercy, grant, that we may never exhibit this inexpressibly wicked evidence of love to the brethren, to prove that we are regenerated. We reiterate the declaration, "If any man say, 'I love God,' and hate his brother, he is a liar," &c.

Mr. W. in his *fifth* paragraph declares, "We have thus very briefly shown '*how* man can co-operate with God,' in producing a change in his own moral character," &c. and adds, "But Mr. F. seems to think that this is taking too much trouble, and has, therefore, persuaded himself and others, that the work here pointed out is neither necessary nor practicable." To prevent misunderstanding in this particular, we declare, once for all, that, man can do no more to obtain and ensure salvation to his soul, in the extensive sense of the term, than he can first produce his own being. We are "*God's* workmanship." Man may now ask, as did the Jews of old, when they interrogated Christ, saying—"What shall we do, that we may work the *work of God*?" And they shall receive the same answer—"This is the *work of God*, [not man] that ye shall *believe* on him whom he hath sent." We believe every work of man to be comparatively good or evil, in proportion as it has man's happiness or good for its object, or the reverse. Now "God is not to be worshipped as though he needed any thing." Therefore, man cannot co-operate with God, in any sense of the term, as assisting God to perform any work. *Almighty* power needs not human impotence to succour it! *Infinite* wisdom is above asking or receiving counsel of man's ignorance! And *unbounded* love and goodness can never receive any accession from the creature, whose first aspiration of love, is the gift of, and flows from, the uncreated Fountain and source of *love*! We believe and teach, that it is man's imperious duty, to succour and befriended man, and, by every means in his power, to increase the happiness of his neighbour. *Wo* unto him, if he does not this. And the *wo* can come, and will come, too, but not in the unchristian shape of an *interminable hell*! We would entreat all men, and persuade

them, "by the *mercies* of God," their heavenly Father, to forsake every evil way, and with full purpose of heart to worship God in spirit and in truth; to love their brethren; yea, their very *enemies*; for in so doing they shall find a great reward, in the present world; and escape the hard way of the transgressor, as well as imitate their great and good Creator, who "is good to *all*; and his tender mercies are over all his works." It is because God is their Saviour and unchangeable friend, whose love cannot be quenched, for it "*is stronger than death*," that we urge all to confide in him. It is because *all* are *brethren*, have one common origin, and are destined to one peaceful heaven, that we exhort all to love each other, and, with gratitude, to acknowledge the benefits of the great Father of all; who "heals all their diseases, forgives all their iniquities, redeems their lives from destruction, and crowns them with loving kindness and tender mercies." Father in Heaven, we will, with *thy* power, spread the "*pound*" of knowledge which *thou* shalt give us, and gladden the hearts of thy children whom *thou* mayest help to *thy* bounty. We acknowledge, O, Father in Heaven, that *thou* alone art God, and "*we can do nothing*." To *thee*, therefore, be the ascription of *all* power, *all* wisdom, and *all* goodness, for ever, HALLELUJAH!

Mr. W. has introduced, in his *sixth* paragraph, the figure of "the ploughed field," or the *earth* "bringing forth fruit of *herself*," to prove the co-operation or joint labour of man. Take Christ's *parable*, (for it is a *parable*,) and the Scripture account of the *earth's* co-operation, and the subject will then appear in a true light. Mark iv. 26—28. "And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep by night, and rise by day, and the seed should spring and grow up, *he knoweth not how*. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear," &c. But not "*of herself*," in the sense Mr. W. would intimate. We are willing to admit the earth has the same *agency* in producing vegetables, that man has in producing the "*kingdom of God*." For it is the kingdom, or reign of God, that is spoken of. See Isa. lxi. 11. "For as the *earth* bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth; so the Lord will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations." Again: Isa. lv. 10—12. "For as the *rain* cometh down, and the *snow* from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the *earth*, and *maketh it bring forth* and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; *so shall my word* be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which *I please*, [See Ephes. i. 9, 10.] and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For ye shall go out with *joy*," &c. Now, Sir, you have the figure; examine it. The earth serves merely as a *mould* or *matrix*, to receive the *seed*, and the *rain* and *snow* of Heaven, which "*maketh it bring forth and bud*," &c. From the flowret of the garden, to the majestic oak of the forest, with all the vegetable

tribe, none are produced by the *earth*, but by the power of God, whose *rain*, condensed by the air, forms the vegetable. The earth does not furnish so much as one grain, in the production of all the timber and vegetables which have grown from the creation to the present moment. And we have God's assurance, that *His word* shall be as effectual in producing *righteousness, praise, and joy*, as His *rain* and *snow* has been effectual in producing vegetables! A glorious consummation this, and demanding our praise in HALLELUJAHs! For the earth (the earthly man) *can do nothing*. It is the *rain and snow* of Heaven "that *maketh it bring forth and bud*." You may now see that we are "*God's husbandry*." We are the *clay*, God the *Potter*. Mr. W. has yet to learn, that "to bring forth *fruits* worthy of *repentance*," and to bring forth the *kingdom of God*, are two things.

Mr. W. acknowledges, in his *seventh* paragraph, that man will be good, when he is raised in the *heavenly* image; and adds, "it remains with Mr. F. to prove that *all men* are thus raised." We have done this already, and inform Mr. W. that Paul declares, of the resurrection of the dead, "It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in *glory*." Again: "As we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the *heavenly*." Again: "As in Adam *all die*, even so, in *Christ* shall *all be made alive*." Here is our proof. Disprove it who can!

Mr. W. in his *eighth* paragraph, denies that being raised *immortal* confers *salvation*, for, he says, "*devils*, grant us such beings for a *moment*, will live for ever, and are, of course, *immortal*." What have we here! *Immortal Devils!* and only for a moment, too! We shall not disgust the reader with a refutation of Mr. W.'s Devil's immortality. The reader, by this time, must be acquainted with Mr. W., and properly appreciate his round barefaced assertions. Now we have Mr. W.'s *own* assertion that the "*rich man* was *immortal in hell*." Pray, Sir, have you no testimony whatever at hand, that you deal altogether in your own stock of assurance? Or do you conceive *your own head* to furnish better evidence than the Scriptures? We are more confirmed in our opinion, that your hell and heaven are much alike. Immortality and incorruptibility are common to both places! Do you conceive the immortality of *devils*, and the immortality of the damned, to be proved by your quotation? Will you reply to this question—Did you quote the following, "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;" to prove that the inhabitants of *hell* are immortal, and that the *devil* is immortal? Are you so blind as not to see the antithesis in your quotation? "*Resurrection of life!*" Sir, are not those the subjects of a "*resurrection of life*," who are raised *immortal?* who have a *life* bestowed which is *indissoluble*, which *cannot be dissolved*? If this is not a "*resurrection of life*," we shall be glad to be shown what is. "*Resurrection of damnation!*" Sir, is this a "*resurrection of life*," too; of immortality? Pray, Sir, what does Paul mean, when he

says, "to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and *immortality, ETERNAL LIFE?*" Rom. ii 9. (That is, the *aionion* life, or life of the *age*, which is enjoyed by believers in this mode of being.) Does Paul mean, that those who seek for the *life of devils*, shall have the eternal life?

See John v. the connexion to your quotation; verse 25, "Verily I say unto you, The hour is coming, and *now is*, [What hour? Ans.] when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." Men dead in trespasses and sins. Christ then declares that he has authority to execute judgment. How? We are told, "He shall show *judgment* (not damnation) unto the Gentiles, and in his name shall the Gentiles trust." Mr. W. is informed, that the word rendered *damnation* in verse 29, is properly rendered *judgment*, in other passages. Christ speaks of a resurrection in the present world, a coming forth out of *darkness* into another dispensation. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. of the resurrection of the literal dead. We treated this subject at large, in a former volume, and have shown its connexion with Dan. xii. 1, 2, that it refers to the end of the Jewish economy, the destruction of Jerusalem, &c. and the introduction of the Gospel. Mr. W. may *prove*, if he can, and not insinuate, that Christ taught that *immortality* was enjoyed in the *grave*; not *hell*; for we deny that such place or state exists posterior to this mode of being. It remains for Mr. W. to prove the contrary.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—I have lately been favoured with the perusal of the "*Christian Almanack*," so called, for 1824. This publication most of your readers are probably aware, is issued by the *American Tract Society*, and the whole of its profits said to be applied to the circulation of Religious Tracts. In reading the editor's address, I was led to some calculations on the probable *expense* and *profits* of this work; from which, I am unable to reconcile some of the declarations to the Christian community. I am very far from wishing to accuse the American Tract Society, or its committee, of embezzling the funds of the Society, or of *wilfully* misapplying them; but that there is mis-management somewhere, (allowing the most favourable construction,) seems evident to me. The Editor says, "that the committee of the American Tract Society, in their ninth annual Report, state, that the Almanack for 1823, has probably gone into more than 50,000 families, and that by the *avails* of it, more than 50,000 Tracts were printed the last year, and every person who purchased one, may have the satisfaction of knowing that he provided for printing a *copy of a Tract*, for perpetual circulation."—Thus giving the *data*, that the *profits* of one *Almanack* were barely sufficient to furnish one *Tract*. When the truth is, that the *actual profits* on each Almanack, of an edition of this size, instead of furnishing one, ought to furnish *ten Tracts*, of four pages each, even at the price for which they sell them at Bookstores, and at

the Society's Depositories, (that is, ten pages for one cent.)

The Almanack for 1823, was retailed for 12 1-2 cents, and it is reasonable to suppose, that the average avails to the Society, were at least *half-price*, or \$6, per hundred. This, for 50,000 copies would be \$3,000

The expense of this edition of 50,000, estimating the printer's bill at old established prices,* and paper at \$2 50 per ream, would be about \$945, which we will call 1,000

This leaves \$2,000

50,000 Tracts, of four pages, (which I believe is the usual size,) at one mill per page, is \$200

But admit the Tracts to occupy eight pages, and add for the extra four pages, 200 400

It then leaves \$1,600 wholly unaccounted for, admitting the Tracts cost precisely what they sell them for, (ten pages for one cent.) But this is not probably the case, as we have here in the Almanack, a pamphlet of *forty-eight pages close printed matter*, at an expense, (on a moderate calculation,) of one cent for *twenty-four pages*!!—Thus by a minute calculation, we believe the *actual expense* of these 50,000 Tracts would be considerably lessened from the above estimate. But in *charity* admitting them at the amount above named, what, I would ask, has become of the surplus profit?

This Almanack is sent forth under the garb of Religion. It has a Title, which guarantees its reception into the family of almost every one, who is favourable to the various *Bible, Missionary, Education and Tract Societies*.—Its profits are declared to be faithfully appropriated to the circulation of Tracts, designed as an aid in the great cause of *Evangelizing the world*.—Those who purchase it, do it under the impression that its profits are thus applied, and that, by this means, they are aiding the vast system of Benevolence, and yet, here is the no trifling sum of *Sixteen or Eighteen Hundred Dollars*, on barely one edition of the Almanack, (if the foregoing statement is correct, and I think it is) which has never reached its original destination; or if it has, no account has been made of it. These facts, Mr. Editor, I regard as worthy of serious consideration. It is not impossible, however, but the Committee may be able to give a satisfactory explanation of all the circumstances, in which case I sincerely hope they may do it. An explanation is certainly due the American Public; and I would respectfully request their attention to it.

AN OBSERVER OF THE TIMES.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

TO THE METHODISTS.

BRETHREN,

You say that "there is but one living and true God; everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible.—And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Son, who is the word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person; never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."

You will be so charitable, I hope, as to believe me to be honest and sincere, when I inform you that the above statements, to my understanding, are by no means free from contradiction and solecism. I beseech you not to be offended, but attend with candor to what I will endeavour to point out as inconsistencies in what I have quoted from your faith.

1st. You say, that the one living and true God, is without parts.

2d. You say, that in this God there are three persons. These three persons you call the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Is not this a direct contradiction? Are there not three parts, to what you say has no parts? If you say that the person of the Father is also the other two persons, that the person of the Son is also the other two, and that the person of the Holy Ghost is also the other two, need you be told that your language would be more correct, if you said that God has three names, but that he has but one person? But if you insist that there are three persons, then you must, as I think, allow that that portion or part of the Godhead which constitutes the Father, is no part of that portion of the Godhead which constitutes either of the other two. So also, you must allow, that that portion called the Son, is not identically the same portion of the Godhead which constitutes the person of the Father, and the person of the Holy Ghost; and the same may be said of the person which you place last in the holy trinity.

That we may have a clear idea of the evident distinction of parts in the Godhead, let us suppose that one, who has a true and correct understanding of this holy mystery, should address a prayer to the second person; the question is, would either the first or third person know himself to be addressed? If you say that the Father and the Holy Ghost would know that they were equally addressed with the Son, then you come again to the idea of one person who has three names. But if you allow that neither person would know himself to be addressed only the person of the Son, then you establish the idea of a distinction of parts in the Godhead.

Furthermore, you establish the idea of this dis-

* I have estimated the work at 50 cents per token and 1000 ems, (technical terms in Printing;) but I believe it is a fact, that you can go into almost any Printing Office in New-York, and get work done for four fifths of that amount.

tion, beyond all contradiction, in saying that "the Son, who is the word of the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin." You certainly do not mean that the person of the Father, or that the person of the Holy Ghost took man's nature; but only the person of the Son. If the person of the Son took man's nature, and the persons of the Father and the Holy Ghost did not, then there is a plain distinction of parts in the Godhead; for this person who has taken man's nature, belongs as truly and essentially to the Godhead as either of the other two persons, neither of which have taken man's nature.

But here is another solecism, if my understanding correctly serves me; for you say, that by the Son's taking the nature of man, "two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person." Here you contend, that the person of the Father, and the person of the Holy Ghost, are just as much joined to the nature of man, as was the person of the Son. Why then do you say, that it was the person of the Son, in distinction from the person of the Father, and the person of the Holy Ghost, that took man's nature? If by the Son's taking man's nature, the whole Godhead, which consists of the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was joined to man's nature, never to be separated, where is the propriety in saying that the Son any more took man's nature, in the womb of the blessed virgin, than did the Father or the Holy Ghost?

Did not the Father and the Holy Ghost become united to man's nature, at the time and in the same place that the Son did? If you say they did, then you must know that there is no more propriety in saying that the Son took man's nature, than in saying that the Father and the Holy Ghost took man's nature. But

There is a more glaring absurdity still, in this creed; for you say the true Christ, who was constituted of the two whole natures of the Godhead and manhood, (which Christ must certainly contain, all the three persons in the Godhead, and the nature of man too, this Christ, you say,) "suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." If a Christ who was composed of the whole and perfect natures of the Godhead and manhood, was ever crucified, dead and buried, then was that Godhead, which consisted of the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, crucified, dead, and buried; and man's nature too, was crucified, dead, and buried! Does not this absurdity defy all comparison? But as monstrous as it is, it has its equal; for you say that this Christ, who consists of the whole Godhead and manhood, "suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us!" Pray, who is the Father of the "whole and perfect nature of the Godhead," which consists of the three persons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? This Father cannot be that Father which is one of the persons in the Godhead, because the Christ, who suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile the Father to us, was constituted of the whole and perfect nature of the Godhead. It is no more

consistent with reason, to say that Christ reconciled the first person in the trinity to us, than it is to say that he reconciled the second, and the third; unless you please to add another contradiction, and say, that neither of the persons in the Godhead, was unreconciled to us, only the Father. If you say the person of the Father only was unreconciled to us, do you not see that you divide the minds of the persons in the Godhead, and so separate them, that one may be unreconciled to us, while the others are not?

But as I do not believe that you mean that the Father, who was reconciled to us by the sufferings of Christ, was the Father of the Godhead, I must candidly believe that you have stated things in your creed that you have not the least conception of; and that it is impossible for the human understanding to discover rationality and consistency in such statements.

Once more, dear brethren, and I have done with this *mystery*. As you believe that the Father was reconciled to us, do you not understand that you make the Father a changeable Being? And would it not be more consistent with reason, as well as with divine revelation, to believe that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them?"

DEDICATION.

The new Meeting-House erected the present season in Bernardston, (Mass.) was dedicated to the service of the "God of the whole earth," October 7th. Brs. David Ballou, H. H. Winchester, and John Brooks, assisted in the ceremony. In the afternoon, Br. John Brooks was ordained to the work of the Ministry of Reconciliation. *U. Mag.*

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

WHAT IS THE DEVIL?

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY EVENING next, at half past 8 o'clock. Subject, Luke viii. 27—33. When, "That OLD SERPENT, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world," will be *unmasked*, and exposed to the view of the audience. His *origin* will be proved, and illustrated, and his *end*, and the *manner* of it, explained and proved also. Those who believe in the PERSONALITY of the Devil, will have an opportunity to show, how a "blind and dumb devil," (Matt. xii. 22.) can see and talk! Also, to prove that a devil who is both "blind and dumb," can "deceive the whole world." Also, to prove that the translators were authorized to deceive the English reader, by giving words of a different import, the same signification.

"The Lord rebuke thee, Satan." And the Lord will rebuke him, whether he be "Peter," or another who shall "savour the things that be of men, and not of God."

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1823.

NO. 28.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

Messrs. Editors—You may think I take an improper freedom in requesting your attention to the documents which I am about to lay before you; but being resolved on bringing them into some notice, it is no more than generous that I address them first to you, who are the most immediately concerned, and then leave you to accept or refuse the chance I give you of making your own remarks, and sharing equally with me in the management of the case.

The documents I speak of, have been already inserted in your Magazine; and what is strange, it seems you published them unsolicited, and entirely of your own accord, notwithstanding they were designed to prove that your favourite doctrine of Universalism, is irreligious and licentious in its tendency.

The first, in order, is that which you republished, some two or three months ago, from the Christian Mirror, stating, on the authority of a Missionary Trustee, "That a woman who had been brought up in a family of Universalists, did not know who Jesus Christ was; and that she could not remember to have heard even his name, till she heard it mentioned by her own daughter; although the place of her birth and education, was not remote from a house of worship, and the town had been favoured with the ministry of the word, during the labouring part of one man's life." This fact proves, as the Editor of the Mirror meant it should, that there is an almost total neglect of all religion, not only in the particular family who brought up this woman, but also among Universalists in general; for did Universalists in general often converse about Christ, and did their ministers mention him, as other ministers do, it is nowise probable that a single instance of such heathenish ignorance as this could be found among them. Every one of them would, in some way, and by some means, at least hear of Christ. I see you smile, gentlemen, and I anticipate your question; you will ask me, How it happens, if this story is true, that this woman was never told of Jesus Christ, by her neighbours and town's people, who it seems were orthodox, and lived under orthodox preaching? I expect that you will attempt to triumph over me here, and say that the story itself makes out that these orthodox neighbours and town's people, said as little about Christ, as did the family by whom the woman was brought up; so that, if the story proves any thing, it proves the irreligion of perhaps a dozen orthodox families to that of one Universalist family! You are welcome, gentlemen, to any triumph this turn can afford

you; but do you not know you have no right to make a document prove what it was not designed to prove? The fact is, this document was never intended to prove that the orthodox are irreligious; and you pervert its manifest design when you use it for such a purpose.

Mr. Streeter and yourselves affected to disbelieve this story, and, as you recollect, called on the Editor of the Mirror for an opportunity to ascertain either its truth or falsehood; which he would not grant you. Now, all this manœuvring was wholly foreign from the purpose: you cannot deny that it was your design to throw the odium off from yourselves, by proving that the story was false, and so to expose the Editor of the Mirror; and this, you well knew, was far from being his purpose in publishing the story. His purpose was manifestly enough to bring Universalism, not himself, or the trustee, into disgrace and abhorrence; and what right had you to wander from this object? I beseech you, gentlemen, weigh well this document, indulge no cavilling, and practise no manœuvres, but judge of it simply, according to its manifest intention.

The second document to which I call your attention, is the statement which the Editor of the Zion's Herald has, in a manner proposed to attest to, viz. That he has often heard the immoral offender, when reproved by some pious person, reply, "I have my punishment as I progress in life, I will take my pleasure after my own way!" This proves that the doctrine of men's being punished in the actual commission of sin, leads them to expect much pleasure in sin. It is of no use to urge, as I suppose you will, the natural impossibility that a belief that sin itself is torment, should lead men to think it pleasure. This argument, I admit, might pass among people who make no more allowance for impossibilities in religion, than in natural things; but we, gentlemen, know too much of mystery, to be at all perplexed by it. We believe in the reconciliation of an offended, and at the same time, an unchangeable God; we believe in the creation of millions of immortal souls for a purpose which the Creator all the while knew would be frustrated; we believe in the trinity as stated in the discipline—and what do you think, after all this, we care for impossibilities? You adopt the same manœuvre in this, as in the former case: denying the truth of the story, and calling on the Editor of the Herald for names, times, and places; things that are not thought of now-a-days, and have no existence in three-fourths of the stories circulating among us. Indeed, I believe it is generally thought safer and more convenient to lay them aside altogether, as they are very

unmanageable, and somewhat dangerous, having destroyed the reputation of some good and very zealous men.

The third document of this sort, is that first published in the Religious Intelligencer, and from thence inserted in the Christian Watchman, and finally, in the Religious Inquirer, and in your Magazine; stating, "that a Universalist, dying in a fit of intoxication, lay undiscovered in an old house nearly three days, and that he was then buried with pitch-forks and shovels. If this does not prove a general depravity among Universalists, it proves, at least, that *one* of them was abandoned; and even this circumstance marks the distinction between your sect and the orthodox so strikingly, that I hope the Editors of the Religious Intelligencer, and Christian Watchman, will not be ashamed of their promptness in laying the account before the public. I feel, for once, disposed to gratify your desire for names, places, &c. Know, then, that it is said, this story was written by a Baptist minister, living somewhere about Vernon, (N. Y.) and that the circumstance did actually occur at that place, in the manner described, but with this addition, that the man had never pretended to be a Universalist; and that there were no pitch-forks used at his burial, nor shovels, except at his grave. If one who was not a Universalist came to his end in this shocking way, how awful must we suppose will be the fate of Universalists themselves!

The fourth document is one published under the head of "*Universalism*," in the Concord Repository, Newburyport Herald, and Zion's Herald; and inserted with remarks in the Christian Intelligencer, and in your Magazine. It stated, "That a Universalist, confined in the State Prison at Concord, N. H. declared, while on his death bed, that he never had believed Universalism; but that the doctrine had, notwithstanding, stifled his conscience, and quieted his fears! Look here, I beseech you, gentlemen, for your soul's sake, look here, and see how pernicious the effect of your doctrine is, even on those who have never believed it! Here you discover an extent of wickedness in Universalism which, I humbly trust, is peculiar to itself. Another doctrine may, perhaps, corrupt the circle of its believers; but it is reserved for Universalism to break over this natural boundary, and to lead captive those who do not yield to it, as well as those who do!

I am aware that many of your friends and adherents affect to consider all these documents as so many foolish stories invented by the malice of opposers; and, as proof that this is the case, it has been urged that the stories are, in themselves, absurd, and that whenever you have called on the publisher for names, times, and places, they have not been able to answer a word. Some of your adherents indulge their mirth, and say, that it is somewhat curious to observe that when the enemies of Universalism attempt to prove it licentious, they generally fabricate a falsehood for the purpose; and thus show themselves to be as depraved as they ever thought of making Universalists appear. But I tell

them they gain nothing by this remark in which they appear to triumph so much; for allowing it is correct, (which may be the case,) it only proves that Universalism corrupts its opposers instead of its friends. Now, this shows it to be quite as detrimental to society, as it would be if it corrupted its believers. And, indeed, I think rather more so; for there are more who oppose, than who believe it; so that the evil extends *farther* in this case than it would in the other. Go which way you will, gentlemen, admit or deny the truth of these documents, you see they must still prove your doctrine to be pernicious.

I was surprised, on examining the attack of the Christian Register against Universalists, to perceive that the Editor had inserted no such *proofs* as other Editors do, of its pernicious influence. He, to be sure, did his best to *assert* that it was licentious; and so far, I know of none who have done better than himself. But he paused in the very prospect of victory, and left the field to the enemy, when but one more charge would have ensured him conquest. He could have stated that a Universalist minister, who had grown grey in his wicked calling, never heard of such a thing as a Bible—or something of this sort, which might have been manufactured on the instant; and that he neglected to adopt so effectual, and at the same time, so common a measure, I shall ever look upon as an indication that he felt too favourably towards your cause, and was partially under the influence of your doctrine, as many others of his denomination are supposed to be.

I have now said what I had to say concerning those documents. I hope you and others will profit thereby. But be that as it may, I know my duty, and will perform it. The matter shall not rest here. If the documents already published will not operate effectually, others shall. I have now some dozens on hand, of my own contrivance; and you shall see them, and the world shall see them, appearing in various papers, from time to time, with proper signatures, and suitable asseverations of truth. You may demand names, times, and places as long as you please, but I solemnly assure you, it shall all be in vain, for they are a sort of commodity I will never deal in. Yours, &c. FABRICATOR.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from page 210.)

"In his *fifth* paragraph, Mr. F. contends that *no* man, 'Christ excepted,' ever *did*, or ever *can* keep the commandments, 'in this mode of being.' We have already shown that every man *does* keep them who loves the Lord and his neighbour in the manner required; and that every one *does* so love who has 'passed from death unto life.' But we would ask Mr. F. why were the commandments given to men, 'in this mode of being,' if they can only be kept by saints and angels in heaven? Why were they not given to angels instead of men? Perhaps Mr. F. will answer that Christ kept them *for us*, in our *room* and *stead*, and that we shall receive the reward of his services. Why, then, did not the householder, who

hired men into his vineyard, permit them to 'stand all the day idle,' while he performed their duty for them, and then give to every man a penny for services which they did not (if you please, say *could not*) perform? Had he done so, the *idlers* might well have exclaimed, with Mr. Fitz, '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!' [See page 177 of this number, sixth paragraph.]

"But the fact is, God does not mock his children by giving them *laws*, without giving them, also, the power to observe and obey them. To suppose that the fountain of love and wisdom would give forth precepts to observe, which he knew they were utterly incapable of fulfilling, fills the serious mind with shocking ideas, altogether repugnant to the nature of the Deity, and must tend to induce hard thoughts concerning him; but, blessed be his holy name, this is not the truth of the case; he gathers not where he has not strawed, nor does he reap where he has not first sown; he requireth no more of his creature than according to what he has, not according to what he has not. *All the precepts of life are within our ability to perform*; not indeed of ourselves, but from him in whom we live, move, and have our being, and without whom we can do nothing.

"Again—What does our Lord mean by saying, that 'whosoever shall *do* and teach [the commandments] the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven?' If *no one* can do this, why was the assertion made? Mr. F. repeatedly says that his doctrine 'is the scripture itself.' Let us test the truth of this assertion by comparing the language of scripture with the language of Mr. Fitz, which can be done best in the way of dialogue.

"*Bible.* Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, *but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven.* Matt. vii. 21.

"*Mr. F.* 'Has any man, Christ excepted, ever done the will of our Heavenly Father?' '*Man can do nothing.* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* If ye know these things, *blessed are ye if ye do them.* John xiii. 17.

"*Mr. F.* 'It is impossible for a man to become good and happy, [blessed] *unless God makes him so,*' in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* Why call ye me Lord, Lord, *and do not the things which I say?* Luke vi. 46.

"*Mr. F.* We cannot do these things! '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* Many shall say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many virtues? but then will I confess to them, I never *knew* you, depart from me *ye that work iniquity.* Matt. vii. 22, 23.

"*Mr. F.* 'Is it possible for a finite being to have more power than an infinite being? For the creature to have more power than the creator?' How, then, can *man* work iniquity? '*Man can do nothing.* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.

"*Mr. F.* 'Is it not very strange to talk of poor

man, a mere worm of the dust, who cannot exist for a moment without the help of God, successfully *resisting* almighty power? We are astonished at this mode of reasoning.' '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment. Matt. xxv. 46.

"*Mr. F.* 'We must have some *authority* for this. We deny that there is such a thing as *eternal* death, which man can possibly be subject to.'

"*Bible.* Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye *die?* Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

"*Mr. F.* We *die* in order to *live.* If man had not *disobeyed* God, he could never have received *immortal* life. Unless he became a *sinner* he could not be *saved.* Ignorance will stimulate us to do wrong, and endanger our future welfare, *unless* we stray in sin and error, and learn, by bitter *experience*, the evil of doing wrong. But how this experience is to *benefit* us, I cannot tell; for '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'

"*Bible.* The inward man is *renewed* [or regenerated] day by day. 2 Cor. iv. 16.

"*Mr. F.* No—I say in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. 'Man, in the aggregate, was regenerated in Christ, their head, and rose triumphant over sin, death, and hell, from the grave.'

"*Bible.* The devils *believe* and tremble. James ii. 19.

"*Mr. F.* When a man arrives at a knowledge and *belief* of this fact, he is 'born from above.'

"*Bible.* Taking vengeance on them that *know not God*, and *obey not* the gospel; who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord. 2 Thes. i. 8, 9.

"*Mr. F.* There will be none 'that know not God,' for '*all* will know him.' '*All* mankind, without exception, will as certainly triumph over sin, death, hell, and the grave, as Christ triumphed. HALLELUJAH! How then can any be punished with everlasting destruction?

"*Bible.* Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and *open the door*, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me. Rev. iii. 20.

"*Mr. F.* 'It implies an imperfection to say that God cannot do that *alone*, which he can do with *man's* co-operation. Man is only the recipient of God's goodness, who affords him means and opportunity, [for what?] and finally raises him incorruptible and immortal, [which Mr. F. says, means salvation] *without any assistance from man's power.* Why, then, is man called upon to 'open the door?' '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'

"We might go on in this way 'to the end of the chapter,' but enough has been said to convince any person who is not wedded to a favourite system, (Mr. F. we do not expect to convince) that the doctrines of *instantaneous regeneration* and *unconditional salvation* are not the doctrines of the Bible. With respect to the absolute necessity of man's *co-operation* in working out his own salvation, we shall adduce a few more passages from the Word, and leave them without comment,

while we proceed with our REMARKS on Mr. F.'s REPLY.

"Every tree which *bringeth not forth good fruit*, is cut down and cast into the fire; wherefore, by *their fruits* ye shall know them.' Matt. vii. 19, 20. 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, and then *shall he render to every one according to his deeds*.' Matt. xvi. 27. 'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation *bringing forth the fruits* thereof. Matt. xxi. 43. 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory; and he shall say to the sheep on the right hand, "Come, ye blessed, and possess as an inheritance the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; *for I was hungry and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye gathered me, I was naked and ye clothed me, I was sick and ye visited me, I was in prison and ye came to me*. Then shall the righteous answer, When saw we thee so? But the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of my brethren, ye have done it unto me." And the King shall speak in like manner to the goats on the left, and inasmuch as they have not done such things, he shall say, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' Matt. xxv. 31 to 46. 'Jesus said, My mother and my brethren are these who hear the Word of God *and do it*.' Luke viii. 21. 'Then shall ye begin to stand and knock at the door, saying, Lord, open to us; but he shall say to them, I know you not whence ye are, *depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity*.' Luke xlii. 25 to 27. 'This is the judgment, that light is come into the world, but men loved darkness rather than light, because *their deeds were evil*; for he who doeth evil hateth the light, lest *his deeds* should be reproved; but he who doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, inasmuch as *they are wrought in God*.' John iii. 19 to 21. 'We know that God heareth not sinners, but if any one worship God, and *do his will*, him he heareth.' John ix. 31. 'He that hath my commandments, and *doeth them*, he it is that loveth me, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him; and I will come to him and make my abode with him. He that loveth me not, *keepeth not my words*.' John xiv. 15. 21 to 24. 'A book was opened, which is of life, and the dead were judged according to those things which were written in the book, *all according to their works*.' Rev. xxi. 12, 13. 'Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, *that I may give to every one according to his works*.' Rev. xxii. 12. In like manner it is written in the Old Testament, 'Recompense them *according to their work, and according to the deed of their hands*.' Jer. xxv. 14. 'Jehovah, whose eyes are open upon all the ways of men, *to give every one according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his works*.' Jer. xxxii. 19. 'I will visit *according to his ways*, and recompense him *according to his works*.' Hosea iv. 9. 'Jehovah hath dealt with us *according to our ways, and according to our works*.' Zech. i. 6.

And in many places, where it is required, that men should do statutes, commandments, and laws, as in the following, "Ye shall observe my statutes and my judgments, *which if a man do, he shall live by them*." Levit. xviii. 5. 'Ye shall observe all my statutes and my judgments, *to do them*.' Levit. xix. 37. chap. xx. 8. chap. xxii. 31. 'Blessings, if they *do the commandments*, and curses, *if they do them not*.' Levit. xxvi. 4 to 46. Therefore the children of Israel were commanded to make themselves a fringe on the wings of their garments, that they might remember all the precepts of Jehovah to do them, Deut. xxii. 12. Numb. xv. 38; not to mention a thousand other passages to the same purport. That works are what constitute the man of the church, and that he is saved according thereto, the Lord also teaches in his parables, several of which imply, that they who do good are accepted, and that they who do evil are rejected; as in the parable concerning the husbandman in the vineyard, Matt. xxiii. 33 to 44; and concerning the fig-tree which did not yield fruit, Luke xiii. 6; and concerning the talents and pounds given to trade with, Matt. xxv. 14 to 31; Luke xix. 13 to 25; and concerning the Samaritan who bound up the wounds of him that fell among thieves, Luke x. 30 to 37; and concerning the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19 to 31; and concerning the ten virgins, Matt. xxv. 1 to 12.

"But why thus multiply quotations? Mr. F. will explain each of these passages in *his own way*, and conclude with his favourite hosannah, '*Man can do nothing!* HALLELUJAH!"

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. W. in his *first** paragraph says, "We have already shown that every man *has* kept them [the commandments,] who loves the Lord and his neighbour in the manner required; and that every one *does* so love, who has passed from death unto life." Setting aside the pretensions of Pharisees, we never yet saw the man who loved his God supremely, and his neighbour as *himself*. Mr. W. will have to show that love to our neighbour consists in consigning him to *his endless hell*. Mr. W. asks, "Why were the commandments given to men, 'in this mode of being?' &c. We answer—Ninety-nine of an hundred of all the human race, 'in this mode of being,' never received or heard of the commandments. This fact is a sufficient answer for the present; to say nothing of God's purpose, to write his law in the hearts of men, in another mode of being. Mr. W. however, would answer for us, and says, "Perhaps Mr. F. will answer that Christ kept them *for us* in our room and stead," &c. Now perhaps Mr. F. will not answer any such thing! Perhaps Mr. W.'s HALLELUJAH "was dragged in, head and shoulders," in this place. Mr. W. tries hard to back out, and would accommodate us with premises which he conceives to be vulnerable.

Mr. W. asserts the truth, in his *second* paragraph, saying, "God does not mock his children by giving

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning the ninth, which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first.

them *laws* without giving them, also, the power to observe and obey them." But, lamentable to add, he denies the efficacy of God's power, and contends that many will be "*for ever miserable.*" This is a palpable contradiction. Now we believe and teach, that the *law of life*, which is in *Christ Jesus*, shall in God's own time, *make all men free from the law of sin and death.*

Mr. W. in his *third* paragraph interrogates "What does our Lord mean by saying, that 'whosoever shall *do* and teach [the commandments] the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven?' If no one can do this, why was the assertion made?" Answer. Our Lord meant what he said. The doer would be great, for he would do *great* things; something more than Christ's immediate disciples done. *Quere.* Was Christ guilty of impropriety in addressing this saying to them? Christ also said, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence, to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you." (Matt. xvii. 20.) Pray, Sir, "Why was this assertion made?" Who can do this? Not Christ's disciples; for the declaration was made to them, to teach them their littleness. Mr. W. finding that argument avails him nothing, reason or truth being opposed to his hypothesis, turns his hand to another method of escape, from the difficulties which surround him; and introduces sentences from the Scriptures, without regard to their connexion, or the general tenor of the book. He observes, "Mr. F. repeatedly says, that his doctrine 'is the Scripture itself;'" and adds, "Let us test the truth of this assertion, by comparing the language of Scripture with the language of Mr. Fitz, which can be done best in the way of dialogue." Sir, we are always ready, cheerfully to abide this test; and we will grant you the favour of passing the *same* ordeal!

"*Bible.* Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, *but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven.* Matt. vii. 21.

"*Mr. F.* 'Has any man, Christ excepted, ever done the will of our Heavenly Father?' '*Man* can do nothing. HALLELUJAH!'"

We reiterate our question, and add, in the language of the Bible, "Now this I say, brethren, that *flesh and blood CANNOT* inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," &c. (See 1 Cor. xv.) To Mr. W. we say, the Bible declares of God, "who *will have ALL men to be saved.*" But you, Sir, *will have a part!* Are you doing the will of God?

"*Bible.* If ye know these things, *blessed are ye if ye do them.* John xiii. 17.

"*Mr. F.* 'It is impossible for a man to become good and happy, [blessed] *unless God makes him so,*' in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. '*Man* can do nothing! HALLELUJAH!'"

Mr. W. has miserably failed in this instance, of producing any effect. For he has acknowledged in

his second paragraph, that without God we *can do nothing!* Now, although a man is blessed when he is made good and happy, still, a man can be blessed when he is neither good nor happy. Proof—Luke vi. 21. "*Blessed are ye that hunger now:* for ye shall be filled. *Blessed are ye that weep now:* for ye shall laugh." Gen. xxxix. 5. "The Lord blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake: and the *blessing* of the Lord was upon all that he had in the house, and in the field." Mr. W.'s judgment had better prove an *alibi*.

"*Bible.* Why call ye me Lord, Lord, *and do not the things which I say?* Luke vi. 46.

"*Mr. F.* We cannot do these things! '*Man* can do nothing! HALLELUJAH!'"

Mr. W. has spoken for us. Let the Bible speak. "A man *can receive nothing*, except it be *given* him from heaven." Again: "The Son can do *nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do." Again. "It is the *Spirit* that quickeneth; the *flesh* profiteth *nothing.*" Let Mr. W. read the testimony, and then boast of his power!

"*Bible.* Many shall say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many virtues? but then will I confess to them, I never *knew* you, depart from me *ye that work iniquity.* Matt. vii. 22, 23.

"*Mr. F.* 'Is it possible for a finite being to have more power than an infinite being? For the creature to have more power than the creator?' How, then, can *man* work iniquity? '*Man* can do nothing. HALLELUJAH!'"

This is *puerile*. What can Mr. W. mean! If the reader can discover any analogy between the quotation, and Mr. W.'s remark, (for it is not ours,) he is richly entitled to all the advantages of the discovery. Mr. W. is accommodating. The pretended quotation and the reply, are neither of them found in the Bible, nor our *answer!* Let it be understood, that we never denied that man can do *mischief*. It is man's power to *save his soul*, that we deny. That man has power to do wrong, Mr. W.'s present manœuvre sufficiently testifies!

"*Bible.* Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.

"*Mr. F.* 'Is it not very strange to talk of poor man, a mere worm of the dust, who cannot exist for a moment without the help of God, successfully *resisting* almighty power? We are astonished at this mode of reasoning.' '*Man* can do nothing! HALLELUJAH!'"

Mr. W. has again failed of accomplishing anything. The words, "*successfully resisting* almighty power," and "*resisting the Holy Ghost,*" mean differently. *Quere.* Will those spoken of "*successfully resist*" the Spirit of God, which shall quicken all men, and raise them immortal? We are truly astonished at Mr. W.'s mode of reasoning, if such an assemblage of words can be called reasoning. Hear the word of the Lord. "Behold, as the *clay* is in the potter's hand, so *are ye* in mine hand, O house of Israel." Pray, Sir, what can the *clay* do? Can it "*successfully resist*" the power of the potter? Men "*resist the Holy Ghost.*" So the *dry clay* resists the hand of the potter; but *water* softens it,

and it is moulded and shaped as the potter wills. So "the water, even the Spirit," will soften and mould man, who is marred, and make him a chosen vessel of salvation.

"Bible. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment. Matt. xxv. 46.

"Mr. F. We must have some authority for this. We deny that there is such a thing as eternal death, which man can possibly be subject to."

When Mr. W. shows that the words "everlasting punishment," and "eternal death," mean the same, then we shall acknowledge his authority, and not before. Pray, Sir, how do you make headway, with your strange notions? First, contend that all men shall have immortality, a life which cannot be dissolved, and then aver, that some men will be eternally dead! We shall expect a little evidence, and more light on this subject. You must be consistent sometimes; this clashing of premises and conclusions does not sound well. Now we believe just what the Bible says on this subject. But you will please to remember, the Bible never speaks of "eternal death." Sir, we are ready to meet you, and all others, and will refute any argument you can produce, to prove that the word *αιωνιον*, rendered everlasting, means endless duration; and that the word *πορας*, rendered punishment, means unmerciful torture.

"Bible. Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die? Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

"Mr. F. We die in order to live. If man had not disobeyed God, he could never have received immortal life. Unless he became a sinner, he could not be saved. Ignorance will stimulate us to do wrong, and endanger our future welfare, unless we stray in sin and error, and learn, by bitter experience, the evil of doing wrong. But how this experience is to benefit us, I cannot tell; for 'Man can do nothing! HALLELUJAH!'"

Mr. W. is to be pitied. He "tries hard" to bolster up his doctrine. When our mode of expression does not suit him, he adopts one more congenial to his powers of confutation. "Sir, this is taking a little liberty; but when a man is 'hard pushed,' we are willing to accommodate. We must confess that man can do something. Mr. W. has pulled our declarations, and shifted and altered them wonderfully. Pray, Sir, (as you will have your own way,) can you conceive any way how a man can be cured of disease, who is in perfect health? How a man can be made alive, who is not first dead? If you can, please to oblige the world with your wisdom. Christ says, 'The whole need not a physician, but those that are sick.' What say you? Christ says, 'I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.' What is your opinion? The motive of the Israelites, was not to die, that they might be raised immortal. But, Sir, God would not permit man to sin or die, if good should not result to man, finally, through the wonder-working power of his Creator."

"Bible. The inward man is renewed [or regenerated] day by day. 2 Cor. iv. 16.

"Mr. F. No—I say in a moment, in the twink-

ling of an eye. 'Man, in the aggregate, was regenerated in Christ, their head, and rose triumphant over sin, death, and hell, from the grave.'

We must be permitted to say, we hope Mr. W.'s readers are not so ignorant as to be imposed upon by assertions without evidence or argument. We ask Mr. W. whether the word rendered renewed, in 2 Cor. iv. 16. is synonymous with the word rendered regeneration, in Matt. xix. 28? Paul says, "Though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." If you please, continued and strengthened, as a fire is kindled and made to burn briskly; in contradistinction to the state of the fleshly man, which is like a fire going out, no fuel being added to make it continue. Our declaration, relative to the regeneration of man, in the aggregate, in Christ, their head, is supported and firm.

"Bible. The devils believe and tremble. James ii. 19.

"Mr. F. When a man arrives at a knowledge and belief of this fact, he is 'born from above.'"

Mr. W. is running wild. When a man resorts to perversion instead of argument, we think charity must assign as a cause, that his head is nearly empty, or his mouth or pen would find arguments. Pray, Sir, what do the devils believe, that makes them tremble? Is it the fact of which we spoke? If not, is it not a devilish thing to insinuate this, and endeavour to deceive the reader? James says, "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also believe and tremble." Pray, Sir, have we said, that "When a man arrives at a knowledge and belief of this fact (that there is one God, which even devils believe) he is born from above?" This will not answer, friend Woodworth; you must try something else. All we ask, is what you proposed, when you said "Fair play is a jewel!"

"Bible. Taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. 2 Thess. i. 8, 9.

"Mr. F. There will be none 'that know not God,' for 'all will know him.' 'All mankind, without exception, will as certainly triumph over sin, death, hell, and the grave, as Christ triumphed. HALLELUJAH!' How then can any be punished with everlasting destruction?"

Mr. W. again resorts to perversion. Sir, will you say, that the declaration you have assigned us, was made by us; that we made it with reference, in point of time, to the accomplishment of the event spoken of in your quotation? We do assert, that a time, or dispensation is coming, when "all shall know the Lord, from the least unto the greatest." But we do not say, neither have we said, that all would know the Lord at the coming of Christ "in the glory of his Father," at the destruction of Jerusalem, to which event the passage you have quoted from 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, alludes. Your question, "How then can any be punished with everlasting destruction?" is easily answered. The Jews are thus punished, "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." His power is glorious in salvation, but the Jews see it not.

"Bible. Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come to him, and I will sup with him, and he with me. Rev. iii. 20.

"Mr. F. 'It implies an imperfection to say that God cannot do that *alone*, which he can do with *man's* co-operation. Man is only the recipient of God's goodness, who affords him means and opportunity, [for what?] and finally raises him incorruptible and immortal, [which, Mr. F. says, means salvation,] *without any assistance from man's power.*' Why, then, is man called upon to 'open the door?' 'Man can do *nothing!* HALLELUJAH!'"

Mr. W.'s quotation from Rev. has no relation, in any shape whatever, with the resurrection to immortality and incorruption, that we have spoken of. Mr. W. "might go on in this way, 'to the end of the chapter,' and effect nothing, unless he convinced his readers of his utter incapacity to defend his own hypothesis, or to confute our premises.

We will now, in few words, "test the truth" of Mr. W.'s hypothesis, by comparing it with Scripture.

Bible. "No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him. John vi. 44.

Mr. W. "Every man has full power to turn to God and live."

Bible. "Ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live," &c. See Ezek. xxxvii.

Mr. W. "A man's ruling love is the life of his soul."

Bible. "Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel."

Mr. W. "Being a free agent, man had the power of turning to God, or turning from him."

Bible. "With God nothing shall be impossible. Luke i. 37.

Mr. W. "Omnipotence itself cannot change the owl into an eagle, the vulture into a dove, or the swine into a lamb. While the soul was united to the natural mind and body, this change, with *man's* co-operation, might have been effected."

Bible. "God giveth us the victory."

Mr. W. "WE have obtained a complete victory."

Bible. "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. ii. 14. "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Rev. xii. 12.

Mr. W. "Devils will live for ever, and are, of course, immortal."


We think the above is quite as much as Mr. W. can digest at once; and the reader, we trust, will prefer truth to error.

Mr. W. continues—"With respect to the absolute necessity of *man's* co-operation in working out his own salvation, we shall adduce a few more passages from the Word, and leave them without comment." &c. Now we think, Mr. W. would do better to pro-

duce only *one* passage, and prove, by its application to his hypothesis, that God's salvation requires *man's* co-operation. A prophet says, "Behold, God is my salvation! I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation." Isa. xii. Sir, God is our salvation! We will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord JEHOVAH is our strength and our song; He also is become our salvation.—You may sing of *man's* co-operation, and trust in your own works; but we will sing of JEHOVAH, and trust in the Lord. Sir, "Because thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and hast not been mindful of the rock of thy strength, therefore shalt thou plant pleasant plants, and shalt set it with strange slips. In the day shalt thou make thy plant to grow, and in the morning shalt thou make thy seed to flourish: but the harvest shall be a heap in the day of grief and of desperate sorrow." Isa. xvii. 10, 11.

Mr. W. has introduced nearly *thirty* quotations to prove the "absolute necessity of *man's* co-operation in working out his own salvation." Now we assert, that not one of the passages quoted has any relation to the subject under consideration. The grand question is the salvation of God, not man. We would reiterate every declaration, and apply them as the Scriptures do, to *this mode* of existence. Mankind, en masse, is a tree which bringeth forth not good but evil fruit. "By fire, and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many." Isa. lxvi. 16. How many? As many as are made sinners. All men.—Saul of Tarsus was slain, cut down, and died. Paul arose in his stead. Why did not Mr. W. quote the 28th verse of Matt. xvi. ? Ans. Because the time of rendering to every one according to his deeds, would be proved to be in *this world*. We shall quote it for him. "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." This is the coming spoken of in Matt. xxv. 31 to 46. It may be very gratifying to the Pharisee, to solace himself with notions of his pre-eminence and goodness, to despise his neighbour, and consign him to an endless hell; but the humble man, who has learned wisdom from another source, will be possessed of a different spirit. We ask Mr. W. whether the spirit which consigns men to an endless hell, is the spirit which feeds the hungry, and clothes the naked? Christ says, to his disciples, "When ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants." Luke xvii. 10. Surely this is a different course from perverting the scriptures to prove our profitableness and consequence, and the absurd hypothesis that God depends on *man's* joint labour or co-operation to effect his purposes. We reiterate the saying of the esteemed Franklin—"That man would be modest, who should expect a rich plantation for a cup of cold water, compared with him who should expect the endless joys of a future heaven as a reward for his good works in this world." The Scriptures are explicit. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which

is born of the *spirit is spirit.*" To talk of flesh and blood co-operating with, and assisting the Spirit of the OMNIPOTENT GOD, to save the souls of men, is foolish to the last extreme.

Mr. W. has substituted the word *judgment* for *condemnation (damnation)* in John iii. 19. Sir, if this is the *judgment*, that men love darkness rather than light, in this world, by what authority do you say, that men will be "*for ever miserable in the next world?*" Sir, we believe and teach, that "God will render to every man *according to their deeds.*" But we do not teach that men will "be for ever miserable," for they have done nothing to deserve this inexpressibly wicked and abominably *cruel torture.* Neither do we teach that men will be made endlessly happy on account of their good works, for we believe they have done nothing to merit that happiness. We are taught by our Master, Christ, to say, "When ye have done *all things* which are commanded you, say, We are *unprofitable servants.*" But, Sir, we do believe that "God will gather together in one all things in Christ." That death and hell shall be destroyed; and God be all in all; for the Scriptures declare this. The passages you have quoted prove our doctrine. They are an exhibition of the day of judgment; showing cause and consequence in *this* world, during the reign of Christ as Mediator in his Kingdom, which will eventuate in the "*restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii. 21. You may now see how we explain these passages; and hear our conclusion in the words of truth and soberness. You say, "Mr. F. will conclude with his favourite hosannah, '*Man can do nothing,*'" &c.  "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: *nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it.*" Eccle. iii. 14. "All nations before Him are as *nothing*; and they are counted to him LESS than NOTHING, and vanity!" Isa. xl. 17.

Query. When "*less than nothing*" co-operates, how much will it produce? Cannot Omnipotence do, without "*less than nothing*" helps Him? If "*nothing can be put to*" that which God doeth, how can you put "*less than nothing*" to it? Shall we now, to please you, say *man can do something*?

"Produce your cause, saith the LORD; bring forth your strong *reasons*, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring forth, and show us what shall happen: let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them, or declare us things to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together. Behold, ye are of *nothing*, and your work of nought: an abomination chooseth you." Isa. xli. 21—24.

(To be continued.)

BIGOTRY

Consists in being obstinately and perversely attached to our own opinions; or, as some have defined it, "a tenacious adherence to a system adopted without investigation, and defended without argu-

ment, accompanied with a malignant intolerant spirit towards all who differ." It must be distinguished from love to *truth*, which influences a man to embrace it wherever he finds it; and from *true zeal*, which is an ardour of mind exciting its possessor to defend and propagate the principles he maintains. Bigotry is a kind of prejudice combined with a certain degree of malignity. It is thus exemplified and distinguished by a sensible writer, "When Jesus preached, prejudice cried, Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? Crucify him, crucify him, said bigotry. Why? What evil hath he done? replied candour." Bigotry is mostly prevalent with those who are ignorant; who have taken up principles without due examination; and who are naturally of a morose and contracted disposition. It is often manifested more on unimportant sentiments, or the circumstantial of religion, than the essentials of it. Simple bigotry is the spirit of persecution, without the power; persecution, is bigotry armed with power, and carrying its will into act. As it is the effect of ignorance, so it is the nurse of it, because it precludes free inquiry, and is an enemy to truth; it cuts also the very sinews of charity, and destroys moderation and natural good will. If we consider the different make of men's minds, our own ignorance, the liberty that all men have to think for themselves, the admirable example our Lord has set us of a contrary spirit, and the baneful effects of this disposition, we must at once be convinced of its impropriety. How contradictory is it to sound reason, and how inimical to the peaceful religion we profess to maintain as Christians!

Buck's Theo. Dict.

CONVERSION AFTER CONVERSION.

"It is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes."

Mr. Editor—Please to announce to the public through the medium of your paper, the conversion of Mr. Almanzo Blackman, to the faith of Universal Salvation.

Mr. Blackman is a young man of respectability, a resident of Lowville, and a member of the Presbyterian church. It is about five months since he obtained the blessed hope of the salvation of all men, and consequently a well grounded assurance of his own.

By giving the above a place in your paper, you will confer a favour on one who is ever ready to acknowledge himself, Yours, &c.

W. H.

Lowville, Sept. 25, 1823.

Her. of Sal.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

What is the Devil?

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half past 6 o'clock. Subject, Luke viii. 27—33.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1823.

NO. 29.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from page 220.)

"In Mr. F.'s sixth paragraph, he copies part of a passage, quoted by Paul from Jeremiah xxxi. 31 to 34; it stands thus, for we prefer going to the fountain head at once:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

"Mr. F. says, 'Let us apply Mr. W.'s co-operation' to this passage, and afterwards adds, 'Surely Mr. W. must admit that *'all shall know God,'* &c. We can admit no such thing; for the Lord expressly *limits* the promise of this covenant to *'the house of Israel.'* Not to the Jewish nation, but to every genuine member of the Lord's true church, to *'the circumcised in heart,'* to every one that *'feareth God and worketh righteousness,'* let his religious creed be what it may, for such an one is a genuine member of the Lord's church, even if he never heard of it by name. This promise is made to such men, and to such only; not to mere professors of religion, but to the *real* 'house of Israel;' not to 'every one that saith Lord, Lord,' but to *him that doth his Lord's will;* to him who has wrought out his 'own salvation with fear and trembling.' It is in the hearts of such *only*, that the law of God becomes written, and as indelibly inscribed as it was on the two tables of stone. *They* love the Lord above all things, of course he is *their* God, and *they* are *his* people. Having, by a diligent co-operation with his regenerating power, attained to that state of the regenerate life in which *love to God* is the ruling principle, the inculcation of *truth* is no longer necessary; teaching each other to *know the Lord* can now be dispensed with; for they all know him, 'from the least of them to the greatest of them.' He forgives their former iniquity, and remembers their sins no more.

"This is a very different covenant from that which

he made with them when he first took them by the hand to lead them out of the Egyptian bondage of sin, through the wilderness of temptation, to the promised land of regeneration. *Then* truths were inculcated, and obedience rigidly enjoined; under all the terrors of Mount Sinai; but *now*, having 'passed from death unto life,' they obey, not from *fear*, but from *love*. This is the new covenant, given to those only who have 'through much tribulation, entered into the kingdom of God,' or who have, by a zealous co-operation, 'day by day,' at length become *renewed* 'after the image of Him that created them.' Such is the blessed effect of *co-operating* with, instead of *resisting* the Spirit of God, which is continually moving on the face of the spiritual waters in the mind of man.

"Let us suppose, for a moment, (what we firmly believe,) that the Mosaic history of the *creation* is figurative of man's *regeneration*, and thus see if *'man can do nothing.'*

"God says, 'let there be light,' 'let there be a firmament,' 'let the waters be gathered together,' 'let there be lights, and it was so.' But God does *not* say, 'let there be grass,' &c. 'let there be fish, fowl, cattle,' &c. No—he only creates the *causes of effects*, not effects themselves. He says, 'Let the *earth bring forth* grass, the herb, the tree,' &c. and the *earth* brought forth. 'Let the *waters bring forth*,' &c. and *they did* so. 'Let the *earth bring forth* the living creature,' &c. and it did so. So in the *new creation*, or regeneration of man, God gives man *light*, divides it from the *darkness*, creates an expanse or division between *natural* and *spiritual* thoughts, gathers the former into one place, and thus regulates the understanding, while the *dry land* is ready to receive the seeds of divine truth. Thus much the Lord does for every human being. But when all this is done, man must begin to *co-operate*, and *bring forth fruits*; 'for the earth (says our Lord) bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade,' &c.

"With respect to Mr. F.'s seventh paragraph, we will merely observe, that the *swords* mentioned in scripture are not all made of natural iron or steel. A *flaming sword*, for instance, guarded the tree of life; and when John saw the Lord, in vision, we read, that 'out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword.'

"In reply to some of the questions in Mr. F.'s eighth paragraph, we would observe that the destruction of Jerusalem was an *effect* growing out of the sins of the people as the procuring *cause*. It was not an arbitrary punishment inflicted for their sins, but the natural consequence of them. It was to avert this

unhappy effect by removing the *cause*, (not only from ancient Jerusalem, but also from the christian church,) that the Lord so often entreats them (and us) by the mouths of his prophets, to turn from the evil of their ways. But they '*would not*;' therefore the Kingdom of God (the church) was taken from them, and 'given' to a nation *bringing forth the fruits thereof*.' In this view of the subject, the Lord most certainly did make repeated attempts to save Jerusalem, previous to his coming in the flesh; and when he came, actually wept, because she had rendered all these attempts *ineffectual*. But, let it be remembered, it was not the mere impending destruction of an *earthly city*, and the consequent *dispersion of the nation* to which it belonged, that called forth these tears of divine compassion. It was their *spiritual ruin* which the Lord lamented, and which, like the self-procured fate of the antediluvians, 'grieved him to the heart.' He wept over Jerusalem as an earthly parent might weep over a dissolute child, who, by a life of sin, dissipation and debauchery, had contracted diseases that were rapidly destroying his life, and *who obstinately refused to take the medicines which were offered him*. The great physician of souls saw his children perishing with *spiritual maladies*, which they had contracted by their sins, and 'how often would' he have administered the healing balm of Gilead, and they *would not* take it. Without taking it, it was *impossible* to save them; they must perish eternally; therefore he wept. Nor was it for the Jews alone—no; he wept over them as the *representatives* of a fallen world, of an apostate human race, 'who kept not their first [paradisaical] estate, but left their own habitations,' and were now self-bound in 'chains of [mental] darkness.'

"But Mr. F. asks, 'If man had co-operated with the Lord's will, and if Jerusalem had been preserved to this day, would not Christ have lived to a good old age,' &c.

"We rejoice, sir, that you are ignorant of His real character, concerning whom you ask this question; were you not, it would be blasphemy—as it is, it is only speaking 'a word against the Son of Man.' It is the infinite Jehovah God himself, the great I AM—the Father of all—who took upon himself the *nature* of man, in order that he might make *it* an eternal medium of communication between himself and us. He therefore glorified this *human nature*, or made *it* completely *divine*, and will dwell in *it* to all eternity. The wonderful process of thus changing *materiality* into *divinity*, was gradually effected by the divinity *within him*, from the hour of his birth to that of his resurrection, and could not have been hastened or retarded by the fate of cities, nations, or worlds. And the moment that process was completed, he could no longer be visible to material eyes. So that the above question is absurd, to say the least of it.

"The remaining questions, in the same paragraph, require no answer, for we never said that man must *co-operate* with God in any process, except that of his own *spiritual purification*—or, what is the same thing, *regeneration*.

"In the *ninth* paragraph, Mr. F. objects to the term *eternal death*, and demands our authority for using it. We are willing to call it by any more appropriate name: we mean the *second death* spoken of by John in the Apocalypse; and as Mr. F. has already asked two questions to our one, (without answering a single one,) we beg him to give us his views of the *second death*, and whether it be *eternal* or not. By the way, let it be remembered that we ask Mr. Fitz no questions which we cannot answer ourselves. Would that we could say as much for Mr. F.

"In the twentieth chapter of the Revelation, it is thus written: 'Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the *second death* hath no power.' But what is this *second death*? John informs us in these words: 'And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. *This is the second death*.' The connected passages would convey this idea—'On such, the casting of death and hell into the lake of fire hath no power.' When Mr. F. clears up this moot point, we will then admit that our triangle is broken: but not till then.

"In the remaining part of this paragraph Mr. F. has laboured hard to reduce us to what he terms 'a dilemma,' by compelling us to admit that man has more power than God. He might have spared himself all this trouble; for we had, previously, not only freely admitted, but had taken some pains to prove, that man possesses not only *more* power, but *all* the power to *work iniquity*. That God *cannot* sin, but that man *can* and *does*. God is omnipotent in *good* works; man alone is capable of performing *evil* ones. In denying this Mr. F. must charge the existence of *sin* upon the fountain of all *goodness*; and thus plunge himself into an ocean of 'trouble and difficulty,' from which there is no escape, but by honestly confessing his ignorance, and applying in humility to that unerring chart, the Word of God.

"If Mr. F.'s *tenth* paragraph mean any thing, it means that 'the man who remains rebellious to the last moment of his existence in *this* mode of being,' will 'turn to the Lord in another mode of being.' But our Lord says, 'the night cometh in which no man can work;' and Solomon says, 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do *it* with thy might; for *there is* no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest,' Eccles. ix. 10.

"But we now come to a paragraph which certainly 'caps the climax' of absurdity, to say nothing of insanity. It is the *eleventh* of Mr. F.'s reply. Turn back and read it, gentle reader—we have not room to transcribe it—read it again—and then say what you think of such reasoning. The ideas contained in this paragraph (unless we misapprehend them) may be thus expressed in plain English:

"When the works of creation (including man) were pronounced '*very good*' by the great Creator, man was a mere *animal*, without an *immortal* soul, and, of course, was no more a subject of *eternal* felicity, than one of Mr. W.'s favourite swine, owls, vultures, &c. In this dreadful dilemma, something was necessary to raise him from this degraded state, in

order to render this 'image and likeness of God,' susceptible of *immortality and future happiness*. The Almighty, therefore, caused him to do what God *cannot* do himself—that is, he caused him to *sin* [for *man*, you know, can do *nothing*, as a free agent] in order that he might make him *holy*: he caused him to be *lost* in order that he might *find* and *save* him; he caused him to *eat* and *die*, and thus secured to him *immortality*! If we have translated this correctly, it certainly *out-Calvins Calvin*. Let Mr. F. say no more about our attributing *ignorance* and *impotence* to a being, whom he thus boldly charges with downright folly. The wisdom of God is *above* human wisdom, but not *opposed* to it.

"The *twelfth* paragraph is (fortunately for our readers) a very short one, devoted to the old story of God's being able to do *any thing* and *every thing*, when the apostle assures us, in one place, that 'God *cannot* lie,' and in another place, that 'it is *impossible* for God to lie.' All that we ever contended for, was, that 'God *cannot* act in opposition to divine order.'

"Mr. F.'s 'hacknied quotation' *does* mean something—we have already explained its meaning. 'Thy people are willing,' and *thy people* always will be willing—for *thy people*, O Lord, are thy *brethren*; and thou hast been graciously pleased to assure us that thy *brethren* are those, and those only, 'who hear the Word of God, and *do it*.'

"Mr. F. is willing enough to *spiritualize* the writings of Paul, when their *literal* meaning does not favour his darling system; but he insists upon the *literal* meaning of his quotations from the Psalms. Would room permit, we could quote numerous passages from the Word, where the term *earth* does and *can* mean nothing else but the *human mind*; the operations of which, in their *ultimate results*, are properly called 'all the ends of the earth,' which will, in every *regenerated* person, 'turn unto the Lord, and worship before him.' That is, every *thought* and *act* will have the glory of God for its end and object.

"But the passages quoted by Mr. F. not only relate to every *individual* of the true church, (we mean every person who lives up to the light he possesses,) but also to the church in the *aggregate*, which is gathered from all parts of the habitable globe. It is *now* gathering, and will continue to increase, until *all nations* (not every individual of each nation) shall worship before him. When we contemplate this great and glorious work, we are ready, with Mr. F., to shout HALLELUJAH! but not from the same motive. He rejoices because he thinks "*man* can do *nothing*;" we rejoice because *man* is doing so *much*! because he 'can do *all things*, God helping him.' Man is now going into all the world, extending the Gospel to every creature! Go on ye blessed *instruments* in the hands of that God who condescends to *operate* by human agency, and who invites every man to *co-operate* with him. We know that your '*labour* is not in *vain* in the Lord.'

"A few observations must close our REMARKS ON MR. F.'S REPLY. This champion of universal and unconditional salvation, is certainly driven into

some very ludicrous as well as some very serious perplexities, in defending his favourite system: sometimes denying, and sometimes admitting, that man is a *free agent*. He denies it in positive terms, and yet admits it when he intimates that the Jews were exhorted to obedience to avert *temporal* calamities. If a man has power voluntarily to refrain from such *vices* as produce *temporal pain*, he can by an exertion of the same volition and ability, practise those opposite virtues which will render him receptive of *endless felicity*. But Mr. F. says, that '*man* can do *nothing*!' which is, doubtless, a very comfortable doctrine for the lazy and slothful; and to prove this *inability*, he attempts to *spiritualize* all such scripture passages as oppose him in the *letter*, until he *spirits away* their plain and obvious meaning; while those which seem to favour his views are pressed into the service in their *literal* dress. This seems like bending scripture to human creeds, instead of shaping creeds to scripture. The Word, in its *inmost* sense, is God himself, for which the *literal* sense is a covering, or vesture. Beware how you pervert it to promote *party* or *selfish* ends. This would be dipping the coat of Joseph in blood; it would be parting the raiment of Jesus, and casting lots for his *vesture*."

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. Woodworth's *first** paragraph contains a quotation from Jer. xxxi. 31-34. Mr. W. objects, it appears, to our quotation from Heb. viii. So, Sir, Paul's testimony is not to be admitted! Will you answer the following question, without any circumlocution—Do you regard Mr. Swedenborg's writings and declarations, in *preference* to Paul's testimony? Do you believe Mr. Swedenborg's writings to be *better* authority than Paul's epistles? Sir, we shall insist upon Paul's testimony being received, in all cases, until you prove Paul to be a liar. If Paul speaks the truth, he is good evidence. You say in your second paragraph, "The Lord expressly *limits* the promise of *this covenant* to the *house of Israel*." Again: "This promise is made to such men, and to such *only*," as do what? You answer, "To him who has wrought out his *own salvation* with fear and trembling." Again, you say, "This is the new covenant, given to those only who have 'through much tribulation, entered into the kingdom of God,' or who have, by a zealous *co-operation*, 'day by day,' at length become renewed," &c. Now, Sir, we demand a candid answer to the following—It is declared, Isa. xlix. 6. "It is a *light thing* that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the *tribes of Jacob*, and to restore the preserved of *Israel*: I will also give thee for a light to the *Gentiles*, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the *earth*." [7th verse.] I will preserve thee, and give thee for a *covenant* of the *people*, to establish the *earth*, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages," &c. Will you say, that the language of the inspired penman "*limits* the promise of this covenant to the

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning the thirty-sixth, which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first.

house of Israel?" You acknowledge that "the term *earth*, does and can mean nothing but the *human mind*." Therefore, your own premises confute you! Sir, the testimony is abundant to disprove your hypothesis. We read, Isa. xlii. of Christ, "He shall *not fail*, nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the *earth* ["the *human mind*!"] and the isles shall wait for his law. I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." Also, "I will bring the blind by a way they know not; I will lead them in paths they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things WILL I DO unto them, and not forsake them." But Mr. W. says, "This promise is made to *such men*, and to *such only*," as do what? Ans. to him that "*doth his Lord's will*," &c. "Attained to that state of the regenerate life," &c. "By a diligent co-operation," &c. Ah! friend Woodworth, you should keep clear of the "fountain head," if you would maintain your system, for the waters of truth come like a torrent, and overwhelm your absurdities. Pray, Sir, are your "*diligent co-operators*" blind? Are they in prison? Are they in darkness? Do the words, "These things *will I do* unto them, and not forsake them," mean, if they do not co-operate and labour jointly, I will forsake them? Pray, Sir, where is the need of saving those who have already worked out their own salvation? Now, Sir, for once, "lay aside the sin that so easily besets you," and acknowledge the truth; that the promise is to those who need it—to the blind—the prisoner—them that sit in darkness!

To the "fountain head" again—In Ezek. xxxvii. we are instructed that God will open his people's graves, and put his Spirit in them, and then they shall live. Then, and not till then, shall they know the Lord. Take the figure—Conceive a man dead and buried, co-operating in his own renovation; opening his own grave! Sir, who is this promise to? Is it to those who, you say, have "attained to that state of regenerate life?" Will you, Sir, even pretend that it is possible for those spoken of by the prophet, as dead, in their graves, blind, in darkness, and in prison, to know the Lord, to love the Lord, to do his will, and to work righteousness? Will you deny that God's people are thus dead, blind? &c. Now, Sir, apply your doctrine of man's co-operation to the covenant of God, in Christ, as taught at the "fountain head!"

Mr. W. continues, as is common with him, by taking *supposition* for premises. Now, Sir, let us suppose you are mistaken, for we believe you are, and you are sufficiently answered! Mr. W. will "burn his fingers" with his sophistry. Sir, if God creates a cause, must not an effect follow? Can it be possible that a man in his senses will admit for a moment, that God "creates causes," whose influence depends altogether on the contingency of man's co-operation to produce their effects! We

have shown, by refering to the "fountain head," how the *earth* co-operates.

Mr. W. in his seventh paragraph, says, "it was the *spiritual ruin* [of Jerusalem] which the Lord lamented." Again: "Without taking, it [the balm] it was impossible to save them; they must *perish eternally*." Mr. W. has *supposition* for premises again. Sir, give us testimony. Your word will not answer. You suppose the *spiritual ruin* of the Jews to be a *perishing eternally*. Paul says, Rom. xi. 32. "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."

Mr. W. in his ninth paragraph, rejoices that we are ignorant of Christ's real character! He conceives our ignorance to be a shield, and that it will save us from the sin of *blasphemy*! Mr. W. gaped and strained, in this paragraph, until he obviated all the necessity of answering our question, and proved it to be absurd. Sir, if you will not answer this question, you shall have another. You say, "Christ is the infinite JEHOVAH GOD himself, the great I AM—the Father of all," &c. Paul says, of Christ, "he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." 1 Cor. xv. 24. Can you believe Paul meant that God the Father delivered up the kingdom to God the Father? Can you believe God the Father was crucified, and suffered, and died? When Paul says, "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," (Ephes. iii. 14.) can Paul mean that he bowed his knees unto a being who was the Father of himself? Paul says, "God was in Christ." Does he mean, God is in himself? When Paul says, "God will judge the world in righteousness by MAN whom he hath ordained," and the man he hath raised from the dead, does he mean that God will judge the world by JEHOVAH, by himself? Acts xvii. 31. When Christ says, "The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son," does he mean, the Father hath committed all judgment unto himself? When Christ says, "There is another who beareth witness of me," does he mean that there is not another, but that himself beareth witness of himself? John v. 22, 32. When Christ says, "The Father hath sent ME," (ver. 37,) does he mean that he is the Father, and that the Father came himself? Was Peter guilty of blasphemy, when he said, "Jesus of Nazareth [is] a man appointed of God by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him?" Acts ii. 22. You speak "of a wonderful process of *changing MATERIALITY into divinity*." Do you mean that *materiality was changed, and become God*? If so, has not God received an accession? Is not God altered? If you do not mean this, what do you mean?

Mr. W. in his eleventh paragraph tries to escape from his difficulties, by using the term *second death*, for eternal death; thus making the words *second* and *eternal* synonymous. This is certainly "a wonderful process" in argument! Pray, Sir, how can a *second* be *eternal*? What was the *first*? According to Mr. W. we do "not answer a single question." We shall leave this matter to the judgment of the reader. Of the *second death*, we answer at

once, no death can be *eternal*. Paul says, "The last enemy shall be destroyed, *death*."

Mr. W. in his *twelfth* paragraph covers himself, as he supposes, with a veil of profound wisdom, and cries from under his covering—Come out, Sir, and show yourself. Prove that the word *second*, means *eternal*! We do not approve of your manner of illustration. We believe that *death* and the *grave*, [not hell] have no power over the mind of those who by faith have part in Christ's resurrection, which is the first. They believe that Christ triumphed over *death and the grave*, and that they shall triumph also, "God giving them the victory." The "life they now live, they live by faith of the Son of God." His faith was, that he should triumph. Theirs is the same. What is the *first* death? Ans. "To be *carnally minded* is death." Can man suffer another, a *second* death, from any cause? Yes. From what? Ans. *Unbelief*. They do not believe in Christ's triumph, as the "head of every man," and therefore die a *second* time, in their own apprehension that the destruction of *death* and the *grave* will destroy *them* also. Sir, the consequences resulting from Christ's resurrection are the destruction of *death* and the *grave*. Those who deny this, suffer. A "*lake of fire*" is an emphatic figure of Christ's triumphant victory. It will burn every combustible thrown into it. It will utterly destroy. Death and the grave are as completely destroyed, as wood or stubble would be, thrown into a *lake of fire*. This destruction is glorious to the believer. It is terrible to the unbeliever, whose fears torment him, and are a death to his comforts. Mr. W. may now gather the fragments of his *triangle*.

Mr. W.'s *thirteenth* paragraph is a hard struggle to escape from the absurdities of his own conclusions. (We request the reader to look again at our exhibition of Mr. W.'s premises, and see if he is not in a dilemma, and a *distressing* one too.) Sir, we are declaring again and again, that man has power to do *mischiefs*. Why do you, Jew-like, raise this dust in the readers' eyes, to escape from your blunders? Why do you not candidly acknowledge your mistake, or honestly defend your premises? Sir, there can be no argument without words; but there can be many words without argument.

Our *tenth* paragraph also proves too hard for Mr. W. As he will not reply to it, we turn it over to the reader. Sir, let the night come when no *man* can work. Lay *man* in the *grave*. We ask you, Sir, will a night come when *God* cannot work? Christ says, It is the work of *God*, that we shall believe, &c. According to the prophet, (Ezek. xxxvii.) *God will open the graves*, and put his Spirit in the *dead*, and they shall live.

Mr. W. continues—"But we now come to a paragraph which certainly 'caps the climax' of absurdity, to say nothing of insanity, it is the *eleventh* of Mr. F.'s reply." This is very fine, but a little proof in the shape of *argument*, would do better. Sir, every man of sense among your readers, will properly estimate your crowing. We ask you, Sir, to transcribe this very absurd paragraph, which in your translation, "*out-Calvins Calvin*;" and prove

by fair argument, and clear testimony, the *contrary* of our premises and conclusions! Your readers have a right to expect this. Sir, sneering and argument are two things. If this paragraph is so very absurd, surely you can easily prove it. Give it fair trial, and no more twisting. Prove, Sir, that an *immortal* man can *die*! [We refer Mr. W.'s readers to his work, No. 6, page 187, and our readers to Gospel Herald, No. 20, p. 160, 2d col. to find this paragraph, which commences thus—"Now, let us again look at the command and its violation.]"

We are not at liberty to rail at Mr. Swedenborg or his doctrine. We believe he was in error, and might have been honest in his opinions. In proportion as a possibility exists that Mr. W. is incorrect, in that ratio ought he to feel interested in the objections of others, and candidly examine their arguments and testimony. This is not a contest between two individuals, or their compeers, to obtain a palm, or gain a victory in words; but it ought to be an honest endeavour to examine with mutual care and solicitude whatever is interesting to all. Truth is superior to error; as much as pure gold exceeds in value counterfeit coin. If a man's *money* is disputed and its genuineness questioned, he is on the alert at once, to test its value, and when it fails of standing the scrutiny of the essayer, to return it to its original proprietor. Let the same honesty and candour, and solicitude, mark the conduct of all, in relation to the truth, which is more precious than gold or rubies. To Mr. W. we say, Sir, we tender you, in all sincerity, our best wishes, and respect you as an heir, with us, in common with all men, of future glory. But, Sir, when you run at random, we must check you.

Mr. W.'s *fifteenth* paragraph is another struggle to escape from difficulties. Surely, Sir, you have declared, in plain English, that *Omnipotence cannot do without man's co-operation*. We will make a long story short. Is it in opposition to divine order, for God, unassisted by *man*, to put his Spirit in man, and give him life? If this is not in opposition to divine order, then, Sir, your declaration is wrong.

Mr. W. in his *sixteenth* paragraph says, of the "hacknied quotation," it means "Thy people are willing, and thy people always will be willing," &c. Go once more to the "fountain head," Sir, and read, "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but *my people do not know*!" Are not *my people thy people*? God says, "*All souls are mine*."

Mr. W. in his next paragraph informs us what he could do, &c. We have considered his declaration that the term *earth* means the *human mind*. We presume, Sir, you will join with Paul, and say—"As we have borne the image of the *earthly*, [the *human mind*] we shall also bear the image of the *heavenly*" [mind.] Again: When we read "The God of the *whole earth* shall be called," the God of the *whole human mind*. Again: "Say unto God, How terrible thy works! through the greatness of *thy power* [man's co-operation] shall thine enemies submit themselves unto thee. *All the earth* [all the *human mind*] shall worship thee, and shall sing unto thee; they shall *sing thy name*." Psalm

lxvi. 3, 4. How harmonious is truth! The prophet says, "The LORD JEHOVAH is my song." Again: "And the LORD said, I have pardoned, according to thy word. But, as truly as I live, all the earth [all the human mind,] shall be filled with the glory of the LORD." Numb. xiv. 20, 21. Sir, will not every person be regenerated?

Mr. W. in his eighteenth paragraph considers the passages we have quoted "to relate to every individual of the true church, and the church in the aggregate." What constitutes the "church in the aggregate?" Ans. Col. i. 18-20. "And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell: and (having made peace through the blood of his cross) by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Ephes. i. 22, 23. "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Sir, "Christ is the head of every man." Do you believe that Calvinists, Hopkinsians, Arminians, etc. who propagate their peculiar dogmas, "are extending the Gospel to every creature?" Do you "Know that their labour is not in vain in the Lord?" Do you know that "their labour is in the Lord?"

Mr. W. in his last paragraph says, we "are driven into some very ludicrous as well as some very serious perplexities, in defending our very favourite system: sometimes denying, and sometimes admitting, that man is a free agent." Really, Sir, if this were the case, we should know it! Pray, where have we acknowledged, except by your pen, that man is a free agent? Please to define the term free agent; and then prove man to be a free agent! Sir, we wish you to go thorough. First define the word free; then the word agent! Put them together, and look at them. Sir, our cause for rejoicing is not because "man can do nothing;" but because God can do wondrous things; and has promised that "All nations whom he has made shall come and worship before him, and glorify his name." You say, "If a man has power voluntarily to refrain from such vices as produce temporal pain, he can, by an exertion of the same volition and ability, practise those opposite virtues which will render him receptive of endless felicity." We have your word for this, and that is all. If a man eats or drinks to excess, temporal pain is the consequence. Will you say that the opposite virtue, which is to eat and drink moderately, "will render him receptive of endless felicity?" Sir, is eating and drinking moderately, the way of salvation? It will save a man from drunkenness and gluttony; but, Sir, our Bible teaches us, that "God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." If we deny your conclusions, we are told that we "spirit away the meaning of Scripture." Surely, Sir, you are "driven into some very ludicrous as well as very serious perplexities!"

(To be continued.)

LAWYER, WITNESS, AND CLERGYMAN.

The following is from a work published by Noah Webster, of Salisbury, N. H. entitled "An Appeal to the Candid, or the Trinitarian Review."

A lawyer, in writing a deposition, introduced some words in a "mysterious sense," which rendered one of the sentences perfectly unintelligible to the witness. On reading the form, the witness exclaimed, "Sir, I do not understand that sentence!" "Neither do I," said the Lawyer, but all good witnesses testify in this manner; and you must do so too, or your testimony will not be received." The witness, supposing it to be safe to follow the good, was persuaded to subscribe and swear to the whole. When the deposition was read in court, the witness happened to be present: the attorney on the other side suspected some fraud, and requested the liberty to question the witness. On being closely questioned, the witness owned that he did not understand that mysterious sentence, when he swore to the truth of it. The attorney then endeavoured to set aside the whole deposition, pleading "that the testimony of a man who would swear to the truth of a proposition, while he did not understand the meaning of the terms, ought not to be admitted in any court of justice; (and added) that the witness ought to be indicted for perjury."

But the judge being of a discerning and compassionate character, perceived, as he thought, marks of honesty in the witness, and suspected improper management on the part of the lawyer who wrote the deposition. On inquiry, he found that it was by the art and influence of the lawyer, that the witness was brought into such an unpleasant situation. He admitted so much of the deposition as the witness appeared to understand, but severely reprimanded the lawyer for the wicked and disgraceful part he had acted.

In a short time the affair was reported, and the witness reproached. He happened to be a member of a church, under the care of a Trinitarian Clergyman, and the lawyer a resident in the same parish. The minister being informed of the circumstance, felt wounded, and reproved the lawyer. The lawyer replied in a mild but firm tone of voice, "Sir, is it only in the solemn affairs of religion, that you allow your church members to trifle with God, with truth, and with conscience? I have but followed your example. You first seduced the witness yourself, by leading him to subscribe an article of faith, in which a term was used in "a mysterious sense," the very thing for which you have reproved me. I did it to open your eyes to the astonishing, but unregarded impropriety of your own practice. But once have I been guilty of such behaviour—can you, Sir, say the same?"

This illustration may suggest to Christians the danger of subscribing to an article of faith, or saying that they believe it, while the very words are used in a "mysterious sense." It may also suggest to ministers the shocking impropriety on their part, in leading Christians to conduct in a manner so inconsistent with every principle of civil decorum and gospel simplicity. Suppose Mr. T. A. to be the

minister to whom the lawyer replied; if he were not past feeling, must he not have been shocked and confounded?

While I sincerely lament my own improprieties which these remarks could not fail to bring to remembrance, I would, were it possible, sound an alarm through Christendom, to awake the attention of my fellow Christians to the enormity of a custom by which millions have been seduced; a custom which, if generally prevalent in other cases, would render the human testimony perfectly nugatory; sap the foundation of justice in legal proceedings; destroy confidence between man and man; loose the bonds of society; and fill the world with collusion, uproar, and violence.

On one account, it is perhaps a favourable circumstance, that I was once a Trinitarian. From my own experience, I am able to account for the extraordinary conduct I have attempted to expose, without imputing to my Trinitarian brethren *intentional* wrong. But I am not able to free either myself or them from the charge of having acted without due consideration, under the pernicious influence of custom and prejudice. For the honour of the Christian name, as well as from regard to truth and propriety, it is hoped, that in future, the *clergy* will be more cautious, both in giving and taking *depositions of faith*; and that no one will imagine, that less care is needful in this case, than in giving and taking depositions of a civil nature. All Christians should view themselves as witnesses for God, and ever remember that he is of purer eyes than to be pleased with the mere utterance of words, without knowledge or meaning; or by our using terms in a sense unknown to ourselves.

HOPEFUL CONVERSIONS.

There is no phrase so common in our day, as the phrase "*hopefully converted*." No account of a *revival* will pass muster without it. What is the proper meaning of this phrase? Ans. *Hopefully*, means in such a manner as to raise hope—with hope. Now among our Methodist friends, the word *hopefully* means something different from the use of the term by Calvinists. Their *manner*, which raises hope, is, to be very noisy. Generally speaking, it is to conform to the wishes and opinions of the respective parties.

Converted, means just what the parties please to have it, who will undoubtedly avail themselves of the equivocal definition of the word, and construe it to suit their purposes. This word, however, when applied to designate a religious change, must be considered with reference to its application. When applied to the transmutation of *metals*, a change of *substance*, it must mean differently from what it can possibly mean when applied to *men*. To prove, at once, the absurd, not to say ridiculous use of the term, in our day, we refer the reader to Paul, who says, (1 Cor. xv.) "*We must all be changed*." The time of this change is also stated to be posterior to this life. Now, how evident it is, that the *change* which is supposed to take place when men are *hopefully converted*, is not the all-sufficient change

which is indispensable to the possession and enjoyment of future glory.

Strange as it may appear to some, it is a correct mode of expression to say, a shovel or a spade is converted, when it is used for a new purpose. The word must mean, when applied to men, to appropriate to another use. Thus the same man pursues a different course, and appropriates or applies the *same* powers and abilities to the service of God, and the good of man, which he before applied to the service of the devil, and the injury of his neighbours. Conversions of this description are a blessing to mankind. But, a conversion from serving one devil to the service of a dozen, is an evil. A conversion from common pride to religious arrogance, is worse than nothing.

MY PEOPLE.

Modern theologists, when the promises of God are spoken of, say, O! they are for God's people, for "*my people*." True. All are God's people. No! is the reply. The promises are to God's people; to "*my people*." We read, Jer. xv. 7, "*I will destroy my people*." Who are the threatenings for? Why, for sinners. True. God's people are sinners; and the threatenings are to them! We read of the same people, Jer. xvi. 18, "*I will recompense their sin double*," &c. Again, we read, Isa. lii. 9, "*Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem*." Again: Isa. xl. 1, 2, "*Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins*."

We appeal to all honest men, of every religious sect, and ask, If you admit the passages above quoted, how can you confine the promises to a part, who are called God's people, my people, and say, that the threatenings are to others who are denominated *sinners*? Is not this mode of construction an unwarrantable perversion of the sacred testimony? Is it not absurd to talk of *saving* those who are not *lost*; and *curing* those who are not *sick*? Do not all men sustain the character of sinners? Are any righteous, only as they believe in God, and are moved by the righteous, (merciful) Spirit of God? Reader, whoever you may be, with all your pretensions, you are a sinner as all your fathers were. Receive this friendly caution.—As the measure you mete shall be measured to you again, be careful lest your anathemas rebound upon your own head. The Book says, "*Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy*."

A very amiable and compassionate woman of the Calvinist Baptist persuasion, attended several Sabbaths on the ministry of Rev. Mr. P****, of G****, who is also a strict Calvinist. Being asked how she liked Mr. P., she replied, To tell you the plain truth, I am not at all pleased with his preaching. Pray, how can that be, said the inquiring friend, since you are both Calvinists? Well, I will tell you, said

she, Mr. P. appears to be so much *pleased* with the *endless damnation* of the reprobates, and gives them up to the devil with so much cheerfulness, that I perfectly *abhor* to hear him pretend to preach, in the name of the *merciful Jesus!* *Christian Intell.*

INTOLERANCE,

Is a word chiefly used in reference to those persons, churches, or societies, who do not allow men to think for themselves, but *impose* on them articles, creeds, ceremonies, &c. of their own devising. Nothing is more abhorrent from the genius of the christian religion than an intolerant spirit, or an intolerant church. "It has inspired its votaries with a savage ferocity; has plunged the fatal dagger into innocent blood; depopulated towns and kingdoms; overthrown states and empires, and brought down the righteous vengeance of heaven upon a guilty world. The pretence of superior knowledge, sanctity and authority for its support, is the disgrace of reason, the grief of wisdom, and the paroxysm of folly. To fetter the conscience, is injustice; to ensnare it, is an act of sacrilege; but to torture it, by an attempt to force its feelings, is horrible intolerance; it is the most abandoned violation of all the maxims of religion and morality. Jesus Christ formed a kingdom purely spiritual; the apostles exercised only a spiritual authority under the direction of Jesus Christ; particular churches were united only by faith and love; in all civil affairs they submitted to civil magistracy; and in religious concerns they were governed by the reasoning, advice, and exhortations of their own officers: their censures were only honest reproofs; and their excommunications were only declarations that such offenders, being incorrigible, were no longer accounted members of their communities."—Let it ever be remembered, therefore, that no man or men have any authority whatever from Christ to domineer over the consciences, or persecute the persons of any whose religious principles agree not with their own.

Buck's Theological Dictionary.

ANOTHER VICTIM,

TO THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS TORMENTS.

Albany, (N. Y.) Nov. 8, 1823.

A Mr. Covell, in Cayuga county, hung himself a few days since, in a fit of religious melancholy. Fanaticism is truly the worst of evils; and it would be a great point gained, if the love of God, rather than his vengeance, were held out to bring sinners to repentance. A number of self-murders have taken place in the United States, within two or three years, in consequence of the parties being driven to insanity by hearing the terrors of hell preached from the pulpit. When will mankind learn that God is a God of love and mercy, and not of hatred and revenge! That useful men and women should hang and drown themselves, under the influence of religious terror, and thus prematurely deprive society of their services, and their families of protection, is a subject of serious regret; and the more especially, as the cause is by no means honourable to our character as an enlightened community. *Nat. Dem.*

DESTRUCTION OF ENEMIES.

A late Chinese emperor, on receiving information that his enemies had raised an insurrection in one of the distant provinces, said to some of his friends, "Come, follow me, and I promise you we shall soon destroy them." He marched forward, and upon his approach the rebels submitted. All expected he was about to take a fearful revenge, and were astonished to see the captives treated with mildness and humanity. "Is this the manner in which you fulfil your promise?" exclaimed his first minister.—"Your royal word was given that your enemies should be destroyed, and now you have pardoned all, and even condescend to caress some." "I promised, (replied the emperor, with a generous air,) to destroy my enemies; it is done, for I have made them my friends." *Go, reader, and do likewise.*

Rel. Inq.

ANECDOTE.

Bishop Cadmus, of Bellay, although he did not much esteem the monkish gentry, was induced to accede to the pressing solicitations of the Franciscans of his diocese to pronounce a panegyric on their patron saint:—"Admire, Oh, Pandres," exclaimed the Bishop, "admire the extreme greatness of your Saint; his miracles surpass those of the Son of God! Our Saviour, with five loaves and three fishes, fed only 5000 men in one day; but St. Francis—amazement! with a miserable yard of coarse linen, has known how to nourish for four centuries, day after day, more than 50,000 idlers and useless beings. What a stupendous miracle!" *El Centilla.*

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

THE PILGRIM.

O! for the blissful scenes of home,
However poor that home may be;
Soon may the wish'd for season come,
When I my kindred, all, shall see.
But, ah! the rose of hope deceives;
Full oft a thorn's beneath its leaves!

So, in the sun's enlivening beam,
The sprightly insect speeds its way
Through meads, or flits along the stream,
Regardless of a darker day;
But soon the frosts of winter come,
And call it to its peaceful home.

Nature, with all her charms, may die,
And sink into oblivion's tomb;
But mark the flower display'd on high,
Eclipsing nature's choicest bloom—
The rose of Sharon, ever fair,
Bids helpless mortals ne'er despair.

Praise Him, all ye that love his name,
And prize the purchase of his blood—
He is your Saviour, still the same—
The Prince of Peace, the mighty God—
The everlasting Father, He—
Raise every voice; bend every knee!

C.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

What is the Devil?

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half-past 6 o'clock. Subject, Luke viii. 27—33.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1823.

NO. 30.

GENERAL EPISTLE

OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION.

To all the Churches, Societies, and Believers, in fellowship with this Convention—

To all who rejoice unspeakably in the faith of the eternal salvation of a sinful world, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus—

To all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, of every sect, name, and denomination beneath the canopy of heaven—

To all who know not God, and sit in the region and shadow of moral death—

To all the sons and daughters of wretchedness and want—

To all the ransomed family of mankind—

To the vast *fraternity* of intelligent beings who are connected with each other and with the supremely glorious Author of life, by an affinity as endless as existence—

To all herein addressed, wherever this Epistle may come, the *General Convention of Universalists* send salutations of heavenly peace—humbly and fervently beseeching the Father of boundless mercies to shed abroad the benign influences of his all-conquering love, through our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is the image of the living God, and the first born of every creature.

Dearly Beloved Brethren,

The infinitely wise and ever gracious Parent of the universe has kindly granted us another anniversary convocation, and has so copiously showered on us the dews of divine grace, that we feel bound to exercise unfeigned and everlasting gratitude to Him, as the great Giver of every good and perfect gift: and we most cordially invite every sincere lover of truth; and every humble disciple of the Son of God, to participate in our spiritual joys, and partake of the riches of gospel grace, prepared in infinite mercy for all people. We were received by the brethren in the faith of the common salvation, at the place of our assembling, with the liveliest expressions of Christian affection, which were most heartily reciprocated. The business of the Council was performed with decorum, precision, and wisdom; and though certain difficulties of a nature extremely painful, were brought before us, yet we trust that the moderation, patience, and prudence which prevailed in our council, have produced such decisions as will terminate those unfortunate differences, and perpetuate the peace and harmony of the Order. Two of the most able and most esteemed brethren among us were impeached, and it must be highly gratifying to every benevolent

mind, that both were exonerated. The existence of such difficulties demonstrate human frailty, and afford us all an impressive lesson for our improvement. The dissolution of our connexion with brother Dean, according to his request, produced unutterable emotions of sorrow in our hearts; but it seemed to be expedient. If one member of the body suffer, all the members suffer with it. However unpropitious any of these things may appear to our limited minds, we have every reason to believe that under the direction of infinite Wisdom, they are among those things which shall work together for the greatest good of all concerned. We are aware that a bigoted world is disposed to take advantage of every untoward circumstance to point the finger of derision; but if any possess sufficient malignity to rejoice at the misfortunes of others, we beseech them seriously to consider what manner of spirit they are of. If any feel disposed to triumph because our denomination bears any mark of human imperfection—let that Sect which has invariably been without difficulty among *themselves*, cast the first stone.

During our Session, our hearts were made glad by the joyful intelligence, received from every direction, of the increase of believers, the formation of societies and associations, the organization of churches, the addition of labourers to the ministry, and the unexampled prosperity of Zion, in the rapid advancement of gospel truth. The cause of universal benevolence, grace, and salvation, is generally flourishing throughout our happy country; particularly in Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode-Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and various parts of the state of New-York. At this anniversary Session, one young brother was set apart to the work of the ministry of reconciliation, by the solemnity of ordination; and three others received into fellowship, as ministers of the divine word: all of whom, we humbly trust, have been endowed from above, to testify the gospel of the never failing grace of God—and we fervently invoke on them the eternal benedictions of heaven, for their faithfulness and success in the promotion of peace on earth, and good will among men, and in all the labours of the moral vineyard of our God.

The services of the sanctuary were solemn, powerful, instructive, and delightful. The devout worship of the temple was enlivened by the masterly performance of a large choir of singers, who tuned every heart to the influence of devotion, while thronging multitudes and listening thousands inhaled the pure spirit of impartial benevolence, and with joy unspeakable and full of glory, received the

divine energy of eternal and infinite love. From the Record of Heaven's gracious will, and the testament of eternal mercy, we learned that God is the ever-living Fountain of goodness, the everlasting Benefactor of all his creatures, and that no created being can prevail against us. There we contemplated the vast importance of the pure inspiration of Heaven, uncontaminated by the senseless tradition of a superstitious world. There we received the strong injunction of perpetual continuance in the doctrine of divine life and eternal truth. The heavens showered down righteousness and grace—our minds were instructed—our souls edified—our hearts gladdened—our spirits rejoiced—the silken cord of divine love entwined every heart—the accents of mercy breathed in every breeze—creation smiled in the boundless bounty of God—and the swelling tide of gratitude and heart-felt joy ascended to the holy habitation of Divinity.

The believers in the fulfilment of the divine promise, that all nations, all families, and all kindreds of the earth, shall be blessed with justification, through faith in Christ, the head of every man, and the heir of all things, have abundant reason to rejoice in all the dispensations of our heavenly Father, and to let their light shine before men, that others beholding their good works, may glorify their heavenly Father in heaven.

Brethren—While you behold the light of the Sun of righteousness, beaming from on high in all the splendour of unclouded day, and chasing darkness from the human mind—while you are surrounded by the numberless blessings of the all-bountiful Providence of God, and enjoy the privileges of social existence—while, by an eye of faith, you witness the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ—while you contemplate the nameless felicities of immortality and endless life—can you suppress the rising emotions of love to the God of your salvation? Can you fail to cherish the spirit of universal philanthropy—to promote the peace and good order of society—to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly—and to evince, by well ordered lives and conversation, that you have been taught of God? May the peace of God that passeth all understanding be ever yours.

Brethren in the ministry of universal reconciliation—Suffer the word of exhortation from one who would ever joyfully share with you the instructions of divine wisdom, and would humbly solicit the counsel of age and experience, in the reciprocal exercise of fraternal affection, and the faithful performance of Christian duty. The whitened fields of the Redeemer's harvest extend in boundless prospect. The chryselline streams of the river of life in gentle currents flow. The spirit of inquiry is abroad in the earth, and all eyes are directed to the mountain of Zion, to receive the blessings of those whose feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of divine peace, who bring good tidings, who publish salvation, who proclaim the universally triumphant reign of Jehovah, and pronounce the words of eternal life. If you would finish your

course with joy, to testify the everlasting gospel of the impartial grace of God, it is highly important that you give yourselves wholly to these things, that your profiting may appear to all—that you hold frequent, sweet communion with your God—that you teach by precept, as well as by example—that you preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace—that you be instant in season and out of season, in the arduous labours of your vocation—and that you ever keep in view the bright example of our Lord and Master, whose soul was compassion, whose life was purity, whose word was truth—and whose governing principle was, thy *will*, O God, be done! Remember that it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful. Remember that the servants of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves. Remember that our bond of union is not any particular speculative *opinion*, but it is *charity* out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned. Preserve inviolable this bond of perfectness. Your duty is to instruct the ignorant, reform the vicious, console the afflicted, confirm the wavering, uphold the weak, relieve the oppressed, break the bread of life, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine—and let humility, sincerity, forbearance, and charity adorn your lives, while instrumentally directing the triumphant march of the human mind to the glorious temple of divine wisdom and eternal truth. Above all things, be entreated to remember your entire dependence on *Him* at whose mandate all worlds were formed—all beings created, and all creation crowned with light and glory.

All herein addressed, are most affectionately commended to the paternal care and tender mercy of a God of *undervived, immutable, unbounded, and endless Love!* And may all people respond, Amen.

Per Order,

PITT MORSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Canton, (N. Y.) Nov. 12, 1823.

Dear Sir—I am requested by a constant reader of your paper, to solicit you to make some remarks, by way of explanation, on Matt. xii. 43-45. Particularly, to give your views of what the "*last state*," spoken of, is, which shall be worse than the *first*."

Any remarks you may publish on this text, will oblige a reader of your paper, and perhaps benefit your readers generally. Yours, &c. S. W.

REMARKS

ON MATTHEW XII. 43-45.

"When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the *last state* of that man is worse than the *first*. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation."

The *man* having the unclean spirit, we consider to be introduced as a simile, figuratively to illustrate the consequences of the Jew's obstinacy and wickedness. We coincide with our Br. Ballou, in the consideration of the man's house to be the *law* with its ceremonial worship, or, as it is called, a covenant of works. But we consider that it was Christ who made the *house empty*, and garnished it by the completion of his work, in being the "Mediator of a better covenant, established upon better promises." That is, estimating his ministry or priesthood with Aaron's. For Aaron's did not make the people perfect; but Christ's sanctification, *doing the will* of God, which is the *salvation of all men*, is perfect in all respects. To *garnish*, is to adorn. Thus we read, "I will magnify my law, and make it honourable." Strange, that a man of Dr. Clarke's erudition, should consider the *garnishing* to be a "decorating with the vain *showy trifles of folly and fashion*."* This would be a wretched emendation. The going out of the unclean spirit, relieves the man for the time being, of the evil possession, and he goes about. Where? Ans. Through *dry places*. God is represented as a *fountain of living water*. The Jews as forsaking him, and hewing to themselves cisterns which are so *broken* as to hold *no water*. Christ gives *living water*. That *generation*, (the Jews,) like the man walking in *dry places*, rejected the *water* Christ offered.

The man, dispossessed, returns to his house. The Jews from the preaching of Christ, to the *law*, &c. The house is empty and swept, completely cleaned, and garnished or adorned by the addition of that which is an ornament. It is emptied of useless appendages. See the Sermon on the mount, where Christ clears away the rubbish of man's traditions and opinions, and gives the ornament of truth and love. How wicked was the first spirit, the first conduct of the Jews? See the parable of the householder, Matt. xxi. The Jews first made void the law by their tradition, and then they crucified the Christ, the Son of God. Consider that a spirit is *wicked* in proportion as it makes the party *miserable*. For sin and suffering are cause and consequence. Now the last state or condition of the *man*, is as much worse than the first state or condition, as *seven* wicked spirits are, worse than *one*, which they not only exceed in *quantity*, but in their *quality*, or power of producing suffering. Let it be remembered, there is *measure* in the figure. The first state was as miserable as one degree of suffering, in *quantity*, and one degree in *quality* (or characteristic) could make it. It is then increased. How much? Ans. To *perfection*. What! To be *interminable in duration*, and *infinite in sufferance*? No! for that would be imperfect; it would injure and not benefit the sufferer. *Seven* is used as a *perfect number*; that is, whenever used, a *sufficient one*. Jerusalem is rewarded *double* for all her sins. Christ declares the tribulation to be such, "as was not from the be-

ginning of the world to that time; no, nor ever shall be." It is sufficient, because the party are to be restored, and it answers the purpose intended, which was a *merciful one*.

We read of "seven spirits, seven stars, seven lamps, seven seals, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven plagues," and that "in them is filled up the wrath of God;" and that "no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled." Here is a plague for every spirit that the *man* (the generation, or the Jews,) took with him. If you make the last state of the man to be *interminable* in duration, and the plagues *never* to be filled up, you keep the temple *interminably empty*! Now, the reason why *no man* can enter into the temple until the plagues be fulfilled, is, because the man who enters the *house*, instead of the *temple*, is to suffer the plagues, and having endured them, he is to enter the *temple*. Ye sticklers for interminable wretchedness, look at this, and remember, the blow that destroys your neighbour's *soul*, annihilates your *heaven*!

Again: The vials are of *gold*, the purest metal, indicative of the hallowed purpose of him, who chooses his people in the "*furnace of affliction*."

Again: The vials contain the *judgments* of God. The context (Rev. xv. 4.) declares, "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for *thou only art holy*: for *all nations shall come and worship before thee*; for thy judgments are made manifest." Now, if the common view of God's judgments is correct, only a part of the nations can come and worship.

Again: The *seven* wicked spirits are described in Prov. vi. 17-19 First: "*A proud look*." Second: "*A lying tongue*." Third: "*Hands that shed innocent blood*." Fourth: "*An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations*." Fifth: "*Feet that be swift in running to mischief*." Sixth: "*A false witness that speaketh lies*." Seventh: "*Him that soweth discord among brethren*." It is declared, "these are an abomination unto the Lord." These seven spirits make a *perfect devil*.

The reverse of these, are, First: "*Pure*." Second: "*Peaceable*." Third: "*Gentle*." Fourth: "*Easy to be entreated*." Fifth: "*Full of mercy and good fruits*." Sixth: "*Without partiality*." Seventh: "*Without hypocrisy*." (James iii. 17, 18.) In these God delighteth.

The first named seven spirits are contained in "*earthly, sensual, and devilish*" vessels. The last named, in "*golden vials*" and will plague and destroy the first! God declares, (and "GOD IS LOVE") "*O death*, [the wages of sin] I will be thy *plagues*: *O grave*, [sheol, hell, the abode of death,] I will be thy *destruction*."

Again: Rev. v. 6. "And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders stood a lamb, as it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth." The Lamb opens the book sealed with *seven seals*. Then follows, after the *seven* seals are opened (chap. viii.) *seven* angels with *seven* trump-

* The man has nothing to do with the garnishing of the house. He finds it garnished by another. This is a strange mistake.

etc. The seventh and LAST TRUMPET sounds. Reader, if you are a Calvinist, or Hopkinsian, or Arminian, tremble, for it sounds death and destruction to your favourite systems. Hark! It sounds—"The seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, [What! Depart ye cursed? No! Hear! Hear!] *The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD, and of his CHRIST; and he shall reign for ever and ever.*" (Rev. xi. 15.) "Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the *last trump*, (for the trumpet shall sound) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal *must* put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 51-57.

Note. The reader is referred to Levit. xxvi. for a literal enumeration of the troubles which attend the last state of the *Jews*. But he will please to consider, that in Christ, "there is *neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; for ye are all one* in Christ Jesus." *All one?* Yes; as certainly as God will "gather together in *one all things* in Christ."

DEATH OF BROTHER BIGELOW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—It falls to my lot to communicate to you the painful intelligence of the death of Br. TIMOTHY BIGELOW, and his worthy consort. She died on the 11th day of last month, and he on the 5th of this present month. Both died of fever, at their usual residence, in Palmyra, Portage county, Ohio; soon after his return from a tour to the westward. Death, this season, stalks through the land, wresting from us some of our most useful citizens and best of friends, having no respect of persons. It remains to be said, that an afflicted family has been deprived of the most affectionate and tender parents. They could always realize, in every act of their kind parents, the example of their Heavenly Father, who is "good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." The friends of truth have sustained a loss, which will indeed be sorely felt in all their religious circles. For Mr. Bigelow was a man who possessed superior abilities; warm in his affections, devout in all his religious performances, and ardent in his zeal for truth. The pathetic effusions of his soul have often been poured out to his audience, exhibiting to the people the glorious attributes of the only true God, warming their hearts with the fire of divine love. The loss is to be regretted by all who feel interested in the promulgation of the truths of the Gospel; but God is wise in all his dealings with us, and we must submit. Br. Bigelow has fought a

good fight, he has finished his course, he has kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge shall give him in that day. Both he and his companion, died firm and unshaken in their faith, of the doctrine which they had so warmly advocated for years past, unto the very last moment, confirming the glorious doctrines of *universal reconciliation*, with their dying breath.

THEOPHILUS COTTON.

Austintown, (Ohio,) Nov. 9, 1823.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—The following are the questions proposed and answered, at a public debate, held at Nelson, Ohio, in the month of May last, between Mr. Bigelow and Mr. Williams, on the Universalian side, and Mr. Fen, Presbyterian minister, and Mr. Abbot, a Baptist minister, on the opposite side. If you think them worthy a place in the columns of the Herald, they are at your service. The parties were under obligations to answer yes, or no, to each question. T. C.

Questions proposed by Mr. Bigelow and Mr. Williams: Answered by Mr. Fen and Mr. Abbot.

1. If those texts of Scripture read in your hearing, and those to be read hereafter, do not imply Universal Salvation, will you inform us what they do mean, as far as you are able? Yes.
2. Is Jesus Christ the head of every man? Yes.
3. Has God, our heavenly Father, given all men the moral, as well as the natural ability, to comply with the requisitions of the Gospel? No.
4. Do the sufferings of Jesus Christ, on Calvary, render the salvation of all men possible? No.
5. Do you believe that God, our heavenly Father, calls on all men, every where, to repent and believe in the Gospel? No.
6. Do you believe that Deity had a design in creating man? Yes.
7. Was that design a good one? Yes.
8. Did Deity create all mankind to glorify and enjoy him eternally? No.
9. Had Deity any absolute and unconditional design, embracing the condition of every man? No.
10. Is it possible for the elect to miss of salvation: the elect to be understood, all embraced in the covenant of grace? No.
11. Is it possible for any to be added to that number? Yes.
12. Is it then possible that all men may be added? No.
13. Did Deity, in his original, elective, and unconditional design, embrace certain definite numbers to be saved? Yes.
14. Are the original, elective, and unconditional decree of Deity, and his will, the same? No.
15. Has Deity decreed any thing against his will? No.
16. Is it the will of God that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth? No.
17. Is it the will of God that some men should be endlessly damned? Yes.

18. Those individuals whom God hath decreed to be endlessly damned, are they to blame for being what God wills them to be? No.

19. Is the will of God, respecting the final end of every man, immutable? No.

20. Are there any of mankind made holy, fully prepared for heaven, in this mode of existence? No.

21. Is there any alteration for the better in any individual, after this present mode of existence? Yes.

22. Is Deity susceptible of any new ideas? No.

23. Can God form any new design? No.

24. Does not every act of God correspond with his own essence and nature? Yes.

25. Can a God infinitely good, perform an act infinitely evil? No.

26. Is endless misery an infinite evil? Yes.

27. Can any other than an infinite cause, produce an infinite effect? No.

28. Does not whatever God inflicts, correspond with his essence? No.

Questions proposed by Mr. Fen and Mr. Abbot, and replied to by Mr. Bigelow and Mr. Williams.

1. If a man is saved from sin and punishment by the grace of God, is he saved on the Gospel plan? Yes.

2. Is the salvation from sin and punishment on the gospel plan, wholly by grace? Yes.

3. Is there any other effectual plan of salvation, but the Gospel plan? No.

4. Are those who are saved wholly by grace, saved from the curse of the law? Yes.

5. Do those who are saved wholly by grace, through the abundant mercy of God, receive pardon for all their sins? Yes.

6. Do you believe that all mankind will be saved on the Gospel plan? Yes.

7. Do you believe that any of the human race will be punished after the end of this world? Yes.*

8. Do you believe that justice requires, that sinners be punished any more than is necessary to bring them to repentance? No.

9. Is temporal death the curse of the law? No.

10. Do you believe the wicked will receive the punishment they deserve? Yes.

11. Is Jesus Christ the self-existent, the only living and true God? No.

12. Is it proper to worship any being, except the only living and true God? No.

13. Is it right to worship Christ? No.†

14. Can a created being, be at two places at one time, the places five thousand miles apart? No.

15. Does the word everlasting, when applied to God, thus, the everlasting God, signify an everlasting duration? Yes.

16. Does the word eternal, when applied to life, thus, 'eternal life,' imply an endless duration? No.

17. Do the words, for ever and ever, when applied to God, thus, 'God who liveth for ever and ever,' imply an unlimited duration? Yes.

18. Is all the punishment that God inflicts on sinners, disciplinary, intended for our personal good? Yes.

19. Do you believe that any other intelligent beings, beside Adam and Eve, and their descendants, have sinned against God? No.

20. Do you believe that there are degrees of glory in heaven, after the day of judgment? Yes.

21. Will the apostles in heaven enjoy a greater degree of glory than common Christians, who are not apostles? No.

22. In punishing sinners for their personal good, does God deal kindly with them? Yes.

23. Is it a blessing to have God deal kindly with us? Yes.

24. When it is said, that God is not willing any should perish, does it mean endless misery? No.

25. Where it is said that God is not willing any should perish, does it mean that they should not suffer for ages of ages? Yes.

26. Will any man suffer for ages of ages? Yes.*

27. Is God's will always done? No.

28. Did God, before he created the world, design that some of mankind should suffer in hell for ages of ages? No.

29. Did God design that any of mankind should reject the Gospel? No.

Note. The parties obligating themselves to answer yes or no, made a subsequent explanation necessary, to be properly understood.

A PAGAN DOCTRINE EXPLODED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—As you deny the existence of *future* punishment, you will be so kind as to answer the following question—Two neighbours living together, A. and B. A. says to B. Will you take a walk with me? B. consents, they walk some distance together; A. then draws a pistol and shoots B. dead on the spot; he then draws another and immediately shoots himself. *How* does A. receive his punishment in this *present* world, for the murder and suicide? Yours, B. F.

Newburgh, Nov. 23, 1823.

ANSWER.

Our correspondent B. F. is not alone in his musing on *future* punishment. *Punishment* is all the cry. Now the Book says, "*Above all things have fervent charity [love] among yourselves; for charity will cover the multitude of sins.*" (1 Peter iv. 8.) Alas! for B. F., he has not charity enough to cover *two* sins! The Book says, "*CHARITY NEVER FAILETH.*" (1 Cor. xiii. 8.) Alas! for B. F., what is that which he possesses, which *fails* him altogether? Sir, we are commanded to *love* even our *enemies*, and do them good, &c. A. *hates* B. and kills him; thinking to do him the greatest harm. Does he injure B.? We read, "*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.*" (Gen. ix. 6.) Is not this a *punishment*? Surely, you punish A. by the infliction of the *whole* penalty, besides degrading him to become his own executioner! Do you ask, "*How* does A. receive his punishment in the *present* world?" We answer—His blood is shed by *man*. Sir, you have "*eye* for

* The word, "world," implying age.

† His human nature.

* "Now is the judgment of this world."

eye, and tooth for tooth." The common opinion on this subject, would make it *murder* altogether. A., full of malice, kills B. The Deity, full of malice, kills A. Sir, "Our God is the God of *salvation*." Our "GOD IS LOVE." His "charity," or love, "*never faileth*."

Now, Sir, having replied to you, will you answer us a few questions? We read, "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself, *not imputing their trespasses unto them*." (2 Cor. v. 19.) The trespasses of A. are *murder and suicide*. If God does not impute the murder and suicide to A., why should you? If God takes this method to reconcile A. unto him, why should you find fault? If God does not *reckon* (impute) A. to be guilty, in another world, of the trespasses of murder and suicide, committed in this, what cause can be assigned for punishing A.? Sir, be consistent. Remember, the Book says, "In whom we have *redemption*, through his blood, the *forgiveness of sins*." Again. "*All have sinned*, and come short of the glory of God; being *justified freely by his grace*, through the *redemption* that is in *Jesus Christ*." (Ephes. i. 7. Rom. iii. 23, 24.) Now, Sir, if redemption is *forgiveness of sins*, and all are redeemed, and *justified freely by God's grace*, by what authority do you denounce punishment in a future world, for sins committed in this? Sir, we stand firm in our principles. The arrow that pierces us, must first rend, to severing, the promises of JEHOVAH!

Our correspondent B. F. is entitled to our thanks for his candour. We have endeavoured to be as candid ourselves. Our *principles* and their *foundation*, are now before the world. Let him, and him only, who dares contradict the *Divine Testimony*, assail them.

Note—We read, "No man ever yet *hated his own flesh*; but nourisheth and cherisheth it," &c. (Ephes. v. 29.) Again: "He that hateth his brother is in *darkness*, and walketh in *darkness*, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that *darkness hath blinded his eyes*." (1 John ii. 11.) The man is lost. A poor blind prisoner alone remains, deserving our *pity*; for "*charity never faileth*." His eyes shall be opened. He shall come forth from his prison; from darkness and death, to the light of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ. He will no longer hate but *love*. We envy not the man, who can brood with satisfaction and complacency, over anticipated wretchedness. For us, we desire, (and nothing less can satisfy us) salvation for ALL, *enemies* as well as friends. God be praised—He is "*able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think*." We think that all will be saved; and ask, in faith, nothing doubting, that salvation and a glorious triumph over sin, shall greet all our brethren, the moment they leave this tabernacle of clay. We say, joyfully, Father, in Heaven, Thy will be done; for Thy charity never faileth!!!

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

"VINDICATION OF MRS. JUDSON."

The readers of the Magazine doubtless remember, that, some weeks ago, we republished a "Vindica-

tion of Mrs. Judson," or a *Statement*, made by a Committee of the Boston Baptist Association, concerning that lady's dress. Our motive in republishing that Vindication, or Statement, was to do justice to Mrs. Judson, and to all others whose concerns were affected by the account, which we had before republished, of her enormous extravagance. Such was our view of the characters and standing of some of the gentlemen who belonged to the Committee, that we did not so much as deliberate whether their statement was an *honest* one: we received it as such, with the utmost confidence; and accordingly believed that the account of Mrs. Judson's extravagance was erroneous, and that she "*was in fact distinguished for the plainness and cheapness of her dress*."

We now think it our duty to present our readers, with certain statements subsequently made, which, we think, cast rather a suspicious appearance on the "Vindication" published by the committee.

Mr. Buckingham, Editor of the New-England Galaxy, has publicly stated the following:

"A member of the Committee told me, during the first conversation I had on the subject, that he knew, or understood, that she [Mrs. J.] had an *elegant and expensive* one [Leghorn Flat] which she brought from New-York, and which her friends thought it *inexpedient* for her to wear in Boston; and that a certain lady in Salem, whose name he mentioned, bought a *cheaper* one for her present use." Such is Mr. Buckingham's statement. It has lain before the public some time, and the member of the Committee alluded to, has not, so far as we know, denied having said what it alleges. What shall we think of this? Is it the case that while Mrs. Judson had one dress "*distinguished for plainness and cheapness*," she had another so elegant and expensive, that her prudent friends would not have it exhibited among us? And did the Committee in their "Vindication," give an account only of that *cheaper* dress, while at least one of them was aware that she had a much more *expensive* one, of which they said nothing?

Again, Mr. Buckingham states that "A clergyman in Essex County, who may be supposed to know something of these matters, lately remarked in a company where Mrs. Judson's wardrobe was the topic of conversation, that for some time previous to her leaving the country, she had laid aside her *expensive dress*." If it is a fact that this lady had an expensive dress, which she did thus lay aside, it seems impossible, all circumstances considered, that the Committee should be ignorant of it.

Mr. Buckingham also states, that "A gentleman who saw her on board the ship in which she was going to India, declares that she then had on a shawl, which, in his opinion, could not have cost less than 150 dollars."

The names of all the persons alluded to in the above, are promised to any gentleman who may feel interested enough to inquire for them.

If the committee, or any individual, will give us an explanation of the above mentioned circumstances, we shall be happy to publish it.—Editors.

THE "MOTHER OF HARLOTS!"

"It is stated in the 'Annual Report of the Boston Female Society for Missionary purposes,' that the number of **ABANDONED FEMALES** in this city [Boston] is supposed to be fairly estimated at no less than 2000!!!" [Chris. Reg.]

My countrymen! what think ye of the physical and moral impurity of the proud capital of Massachusetts? This is the place that calls herself the queen of cities, that has presumptuously and audaciously appropriated "Missionary Rooms," and a loan office, for the pretended conversion of the world! This is the Babylon, or rather the Protestant Rome, which collects immense sums of money from every part of the deluded country. I wish no answer, I expect none from the miserable spectaclé wretch, who conducts the Boston Recorder. But the officers of this female society would do well to look about them, and for the honour of their *own sex*, attempt a reformation in their own town. Boston contains about 44,000 people, one half of whom are females. Of 22,000 females, those between the ages of 14 and 40, cannot amount to more than 10,000; and it is between the ages of 14 and 40, that the "abandoned females" are to be classed. Thus 2000 out of 10,000 are prostitutes, in this religious city! Can Calcutta, Serampore, or Ragoon boast of an equal number? The year 1823 is productive of stupendous events: It exhibits a town whose orthodox young men are attempting to convert the whole world, when, at the same time, **EVERY FIFTH** female, of a proper age, is a prostitute. **** Let these fair authors of the "Annual Report" speak for themselves:

"We could cover our faces with sack-cloth while we are unable to *contradict* this humiliating assertion." [Concerning the two thousand abandoned females.] "**** Should a just calculation be made, (of the number of abandoned *men* in Boston,) we fear a catalogue would appear on the page of *infamy*, which would **EQUAL**, if not exceed, that of our own sex." And the Editor of the Register says boldly—"Who doubts that the number of profligate men is, at least, two to one for every profligate female!" [4000 profligate men, of course.] Now let us "look on this picture, and on this." The Rev. Mr. Edwards, in his sermon to the *young men* of Boston, says—"Are you not then doing a *great* work? You are assisting in furnishing 7,000,000 of your own countrymen, and 400,000,000 of heathen with the grand means of salvation. And assisting too, in a way, which, if only followed by all the young men of our country, would accomplish the object [convert the whole world] in 20 years." The number of males between 14 and 40, in Boston, does not exceed that of females, [10,000] and, if the Register statement be correct, 4000 of them are shameless debauchees! A plain, common sense man will say, that the conduct of the orthodox in Boston, is inconsistent and absurd, and address them in Scripture language—"Physician, heal thyself." But he who has taken a closer view of poor human nature, well knows that the most daring debauchery and the most degrading superstition, may unite in

the same person. The Missionary Society in Boston, draw a rich revenue from the pockets of profligate young men. Plain Truth.

From the Christian Repository.

MATT. XXVIII. 19.

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The word *name*, by a Hebrew idiom, is often redundant. The phrases, *name of God*, *name of the Lord*, expresses no more than God and Lord. "I will praise the name of God with a song," i. e. "I will praise God with a song," Ps. lxxix. 30. "The name of the Lord is a strong tower," Prov. xviii. 10. "Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever." Dan. ii. 10. "I will cut off the name of the Chemarims," Zeph. i. 4. In all these examples, the word *name*, is redundant, and might be omitted without affecting the sense.

In other cases, the *name* of any person signifies the *authority* or *doctrine* of that person. "I am come in my Father's name," John v. 43; that is, by the authority of my Father. "In the name of Jesus rise up and walk," Acts iii. 6; that is, by the authority of Jesus Christ. "By what power or name have ye done this?" iv. 7, or, "by what power or authority have ye done this?" St. Paul says, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth," xxvi. 7; that is, contrary to the *authority* or *doctrine* of Jesus of Nazareth. "In his name (authority or doctrine) shall the Gentiles trust." Matt. xii. 21.

It hence follows, that being "baptized into the name of any person, is the same as being baptized into the doctrine of that person; or into the person himself. This is consistent with what is stated in other places. "For as many of you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ," Gal. iii. 27. "Know ye not that so many of us as *were baptized into Christ*, *were baptized into his death*?" Rom. vi. 3. "They were all *baptized unto (into) Moses* in the cloud," 1 Cor. x. 2.

To be baptized into the name of the Holy Spirit, does not imply that this spirit is in any person, any more than that *death* is a person for the same reason. And if he be baptized into Christ, be a proof, that he is equal with God, you may infer the same of Moses.

In the words immediately preceding the 19th verse, Jesus said, "All power is given to me." On the ground of this derived power, he sent the apostles to teach and baptize. Was it possible for them to think that he, who plainly declared he received all his power from God, could himself be God, could himself be perfectly equal with the Great Being who gave him all the power he possessed, yea, that he was that Being?

Baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, simply means, initiating the disciples by that rite, into the Christian religion, as originating with the Father, made known by the Son, and confirmed by the miraculous gifts of the Spirit.

It does not appear that the apostles understood the words in the communion as a form to be used in the administration of baptism; for there is no proof that they ever so used them; on the contrary, we are informed, that they baptized in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Lord Jesus, (See Acts ii. 38; and viii. 16, and x. 48, and xix. 5.) They must have understood this to amount to the same thing as baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. That it was baptizing them into the Christian religion. Those who were baptized, were said to put on Christ; they took upon them his name, the profession of his gospel.

SYNOD OF ALEZ.

For the sake of presenting to our readers a specimen of the tyrannical and unholy means used, at the era of the Reformation, for establishing the Calvinistic religion, we insert the following,

From Mercier's Church History of Geneva.

In the same Synod, [that of the Reformed Churches of France, held in the city of Alez, about the year 1620,] it was decreed that the following oath should be administered to all the members of Provincial Synods.

The Form of the Oath.—I, N. N. do swear and protest before God and his holy assembly, that I do receive, approve, and embrace, all the doctrines taught and decided in the Council of Dort (or Dordrecht) as perfectly agreeing with the word of God, and the confession of the churches. *I swear and promise to persevere in profession of this doctrine during my whole life, and to defend it with the utmost of my power, and that I will never, neither by preaching, nor teaching in the schools, nor by writing, depart from it.* I declare also and protest, that I condemn the doctrine of the Arminians, because it makes God's Decrees of Election to depend on the mutable will of man, and that it doth extenuate and make null and void the Grace of God. It exalteth man and the power of his free will to his destruction. It reduceth, into the church of God, old ejected Pelagianism, and is a mask and vizard for Popery to creep in among us under that disguise, and subverteth all assurance of everlasting life and happiness. And so may God help me, and be propitious unto me, as I swear all this without any ambiguity, equivocation, or mental reservation.

Bost. Univ. Mag.

PURITAN SIMPLICITY.

A Rhode-Island paper states that professor Stuart, of Andover (Ms.) has declined accepting the degree of Doctor of Divinity, conferred on him by Harvard University. The same degree was conferred on him several years since, by Brown University, but he politely declined it, alleging, among other reasons, that in his view such academic distinctions were not befitting the simplicity, which it becomes a Minister of the Gospel to preserve.

Statesman.

COURT OF FASHION.

I have often thought, should one of the "heathen" who knows nothing of our language, enter a place of worship among the fashionable religionists of the present day, without understanding the purpose for which they were assembled, his first impression would be—"This is the court of fashion—the speaker appears to be exerting all the powers of his eloquence to excite the admiration of his auditors, while they seem to be vying with each other for the most splendid appearance." It must be revolting to the true Christian, who possesses the meek and lowly spirit of his Master—to view the show and parade manifested in the external appearance of professors, while they attempt to worship Him who dwells with the "humble and contrite spirit." Hearing an *orthodox* clergyman say in his prayer:—"When we come hither to *humble* ourselves before thee," I was struck with astonishment on looking around me—What is here which manifests that we have come hither to humble ourselves before God? Here is a professor* in high standing—see the ruffie dangling in his bosom; here is another*—look at her head dress—surely, one would think, "riches take to themselves *wings*;" see likewise the trinkets and ornaments that adorn her gay apparel, and she may well be referred to the passages of scripture contained in 1st Pet. iii. 3, 4, 1st Tim. ii. 9, 10, and Isaiah iii. 16, 26.

Plain Truth.

* These allusions are not personal.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die."

John ix. 25.

Shall Satan's kingdom stand,
Since Christ hath sav'd the whole?
Shall human edicts go to damn
One precious blood-bought soul?

St. Paul says—Christ hath died,
Yea, and hath ris'n again,
That those who in his power confide
May with him ever reign.

The keys of death and hell
Are in that Sov'reign's hand,
Who ever doeth all things well—
By whom all creatures stand.

Then sinners catch the strain
That seraph's chant above,
And, lowly, bow at Jesus' name,
Which ever will be LOVE.

C.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—Gen. iii. 22-24.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half-past 6 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1823. NO. 31.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from page 227.)

In our last number we commenced a series of REMARKS ON MR. F.'S REPLY to our former strictures. The same subject will now be continued. That portion of the REPLY which we have already disposed of, was copied from the Gospel Herald, of September 27th, and that on which our remarks are about to be extended, from the two subsequent numbers.

At an early stage of this controversy we expressed an opinion, that it would prove favourable to the cause of spiritual truth, and founded this opinion on the spirit and temper which, at that time appeared to characterize the remarks of Mr. Fitz. We regret that this expression of courtesy has been thrown away on our opponent; but, that it is so, the style of his subsequent animadversions will sufficiently show. For ourselves, as volunteers in the cause of truth, we shall use such weapons only as are furnished by the armory of the word; and when we descend to ridicule, sarcasm, and verbal criticism, let the arbiters of the contest pronounce sentence of defeat.

Without condescending to hear us through our remarks, Mr. Fitz has already devoted more than seven pages of the Herald to a rejoinder. We will not say that this is indecorous on his part, but it is certainly impolitic. So far from regretting it, on our own account, we find it the source of no inconsiderable gratification. Sportsmen are always confident of having made a good shot, when an unusual fluttering is discovered among the game.

In the first paragraph of this portion of Mr. Fitz's REPLY, he asserts that our doctrine of future misery "has no better foundation than supposition." In vain do we cite those numerous passages of Scripture on the plain and obvious language of which the doctrine is founded. Mr. F. with a curious species of *leger de main*, instantly changes their meaning. When we quote, for instance, Isaiah, iii. 10. "Wo unto the wicked, for the reward of his hands shall be given him," it is denied as having any "reference to a posterior mode of being." If we adduce from the Apocalypse, "he that is filthy let him be filthy still," it is disposed of in the same manner. If we contend that every man is judged by his works, and rewarded according to the deeds done in the body, the judgment and the reward either vanish at the presto! of our opponent, or become merely temporal affairs. If we remind him of our Lord's own words, "And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal," the English word *everlasting* is denied being equivalent to

eternal, although Mr. Fitz knows that they are both translated from one and the same word in the Greek; and that, consequently, if the misery of the wicked be temporal, the happiness of the righteous will be so too. Why, then, does our opponent call for proofs, and yet refuse to admit the plainest and strongest language of scripture, giving it a meaning of his own, directly opposed to its plain and obvious import? Such a mode of defending a favourite opinion is without a parallel, except in the history of those ancient magicians, who "did so with their enchantments." It is perverting the living waters of truth, and "turning them into blood."

In the same paragraph Mr. Fitz says, "As our subject relates to men, and not to swine, vultures, &c. we shall leave them as the peculiar property of Mr. W.'s system." This may be wit, but it certainly is not argument. We have our Lord's example for calling men by the names of such inferior animals as correspond to their moral character; and if Mr. F. thinks that this mode of illustrating our doctrine is a fair subject for ridicule, he is welcome to amuse himself at our expense. But let him beware that he does not deride Him whose example we copy. He frequently designated men by such terms as vipers, serpents, wolves, dogs, swine, goats, eagles, doves, sheep, and lambs; and speaking of Herod, he says, "Go ye, and tell that fox, I cast out devils," &c. These are our Lord's own words, and he assures us that his "words are spirit and life."

In this paragraph also, Mr. F. reiterates his call for proofs "that the present is a probationary state, and the only one." But if all the passages we have quoted, in our former remarks, have failed to convince him, "if he hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will he be persuaded though one rose from the dead." If this life were not a probationary state, and the only one, would the rich man have expressed so much anxiety to warn his unbelieving brethren? Or was he thus anxious to save them from temporal torment? If so, he was unreasonably solicitous about a very trifling affair; for Mr. F. says, "this world, compared to another, is but a dream;" and "God now permits suffering for man's good;" and again, "according to our doctrine, (says Mr. F.) man must exist, and suffer as he does, before his glory can be perfected."

In his second paragraph, Mr. F. says, "We shall contend, and prove too, that man is actually regenerated without his co-operation." But we look in vain for his proofs. He merely asserts, without authority, that man in the aggregate, therefore, was regenerated in Christ, their head, and rose triumphant over sin, death, and hell, from the grave.

When a man [adds Mr. F.] arrives at the knowledge and belief of this fact, he is "*born from above.*" He is "*delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son.*" Is *regeneration*, then, merely the arriving at the *knowledge and belief* of a certain *fact*? At best, this is only a regeneration of the *understanding*, and not a purification of the *will*, which is what we understand by the word *regeneration*. But Mr. F. a moment before told us that "*regeneration is a new creation*, just as much as the first making or beginning of man was a *creation.*" Is the mere *believing* a certain *fact* a new creation? "The devils also *believe* and tremble."

But the apostle does not say that *all* men are risen with Christ. Far from it. He says, "*If*, then, ye be risen with Christ, [that is, *if* ye be really awakened from the death of sin and impenitence, as ye profess to be, then] seek those things which are above." This exhortation would have been superfluous if their regeneration had been already effected. Mr. F. would, doubtless, have addressed them "*without an if*;" he would, probably, have said, "As you, and I, and *all* mankind, are risen with Christ—as man, in the aggregate, was regenerated *in* Christ, what is there for us to do? Man can do *nothing*. HALLELUJAH!"

Again—Mr. F. says, "If Mr. W. will annihilate the *impurity*, the soul will be left *pure*." To this we reply, that *impurity* may be *removed*, but not *annihilated*; and the Lord teaches us how to *remove* it, in the following words: "Wash ye; make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well." This is the only process pointed out in Scripture by which *impurity* can be removed, and man is called upon to perform it himself. "Wash thy heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved."

Mr. F. concludes this paragraph in the following words: "God made man *good*. Mr. W.'s notions, therefore, are gross errors." If God made man *good*, (as we know he did,) why does Mr. F. say, in another place, "If man had not *eaten and died*, he could never have received immortal life?" This *notion* is too gross an error to merit a moment's attention. A wiser man than either of us has declared, that "God hath made man *upright*, but they have sought out many *inventions*;" Eccles. vii. 29. And this wise man's father says "they provoked him to anger with their *inventions*." Psalms, cvi. 29. "Thus were they defiled with *their own works*, and went a whoring with *their own inventions*." The sinning of man, "that grace might abound," was, therefore, no *invention* of his Creator, and is deprecated by the apostle. And yet Mr. Fitz would persuade us that *unless man had sinned he could not have been saved!!!* If the doctrine be true, this consequence irresistibly follows: the more we sin on earth, the greater will be our felicity in heaven!

In his *third* paragraph, Mr. F. agrees with Dr. Clarke, who *alters the punctuation* of a sentence, spoken by our Lord himself, *in order to make it conform to his* (Dr. C.'s) *particular views*! This learned gentleman, having imbibed the notion that

there was no such thing as *regeneration* "before the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ," makes the passage read thus: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, [while I went about preaching, this shall be your reward]—in the *regeneration*, [that is] when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The words in *brackets* inserted by us, show the sense which Dr. C. gives the passage, by altering the punctuation. In the original it reads thus: "Ye which have followed me in the regeneration," &c. Merely following Christ from one village to another would not entitle a man to the reward here promised, for *multitudes* followed him, "because they ate, and were filled." It is "*following him in the regeneration*," or imitating him in resisting temptations, and overcoming evil, (for he was tempted at all points, as we are,) that "makes us kings and priests," and entitles us to "reign on the earth." But, says Mr. Fitz, "Dr. C. considers it to be utterly improper to make the time of the regeneration to be before the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ;" and adds, "*We agree with him in this particular.*" So the words of our blessed Lord, which "are spirit and life," are to be wrested from their original meaning, to support the favourite notions of such commentators! How is this treating the Word of God? that Word which was made flesh, and dwelt among us? It is not, perhaps, crucifying him between two thieves; but, it is doing that which is little better: it is profanely attempting to adapt his dimensions to the iron bed of sectarianism. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!"

Mr. F.'s *fourth* paragraph deserves attention, as he has there *assumed* premises which our language does not warrant, and from such premises deduced all his subsequent inferences. After quoting our remark respecting that *state* called hell, viz. "thousands would be infinitely more unhappy without it," he adds, "Then, we say, they must be *infinitely* happy with it." Now, what kind of logic is this? Let us state the proposition plainly, and then look at it. Satan is *unhappy* in the kingdom of darkness; but he would be infinitely more *unhappy* in the kingdom of light; ergo, Satan is infinitely *happy* in the kingdom of darkness! If this be logic, Mr. Fitz is the only logician on earth. But the worst of it is, all his subsequent reasoning (if such it can be called) is founded on these unjust premises, viz. that, according to our doctrine, the wicked are infinitely happy in hell! This is worse than *begging* the question; it is taking it without our knowledge or consent.

Mr. F.'s *fifth* and *sixth* paragraphs require no remarks, as they contain no assertions but what are predicated on the untenable premises above mentioned.

In his *seventh* paragraph, Mr. F. asks, "Is not a *freedom of will* very *imperfect*, if it leads the possessor to make a wrong choice?" This is a species of verbal criticism to which theological disputants seldom resort until foiled at every other weapon. When we say that "man is endowed with *perfect*

freedom of will in spiritual things," we do not wish to be understood as attributing to man the *perfection* of Deity; for man, we all know, is an imperfect being. But there are many discrete degrees in creation, in one of which is man; and his *freedom of will* is certainly *perfect* in that degree, inasmuch as it is full, complete, unrestrained. Mr. F. might, with more propriety, have asked, "Is not this *will* perversely imperfect which thus *abuses its freedom* by making a wrong choice? and is not that *understanding* very imperfect which *sanctions* such a choice?"

Again—Mr. Fitz says, "By *perfect freedom* we should be inclined to understand *perfect ability*. For freedom to choose, without *ability* to direct in the choosing, would be worth nothing. You might, with as much propriety, tell a blind man that he has perfect freedom to choose an article he cannot see, as to tell a man who prefers being a *hog* to a *lamb*, to choose for himself." If Mr. F. will pay a moment's attention to the operations of his own mind, he must be convinced that man has *ability* to choose aright. Has he not ability to think of God as often as he pleases, to pray to him, to act in opposition to the impulse of unruly passions? And does not the *understanding* of every man teach him that the exercise of this *ability* will tend to promote his happiness? This is what we *can* do, and what we are required to do. The subjugation of our evil propensities can be effected in no other way. We must fight manfully against them; and God will most assuredly give us the victory over them. But the Scriptures promise us no victory on any other condition. Mr. F.'s comparison of a blind man is irrelevant to the subject; for no man is spiritually blind, until he becomes so by choosing evil instead of good. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, *because their deeds were evil*. For every one that doeth evil, hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."

Mr. F. concludes this paragraph with several questions, in reply to which we would observe, first, that the *chosen* of God, are all who obey his commandments. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples." John viii. 31. It is God's eternal will, from the foundation of the world, to *choose* every one that sincerely wishes to serve him. Thus Paul says to the Ephesians, "According as he hath chosen *us* before the foundation of the world, that we should be *holy and without blame* before him in love." What description of persons are intended by the pronoun *us*? The apostle has not left us in doubt on the subject, for he writes "to the *saints* which are at Ephesus, and to the *faithful in Christ Jesus*." As the *past and future* are always *present* in the divine mind, all *such* persons are truly chosen before the foundation of the world. Again—Our Lord says, "Many are *called*, but few *chosen*." Every individual of the human family is consequently *called*, by reason, conscience, or revelation, to repent and be converted, to "come to the marriage

supper;" but they only are *chosen* who *obey* the call, and weave themselves a "wedding garment."

2d. If we admit the testimony of Paul himself, he verily thought he was doing God service in opposing the progress of the new religion. His heart was well disposed, though his understanding was in error. He was ardent and zealous in what he considered the cause of truth, the religion of his forefathers. To serve God, therefore, was his *own choice*; and that Being, who sees the heart and knows the thoughts of his creatures, was graciously pleased to enlighten his understanding, and direct him how to serve him acceptably. Thus he became "a *chosen vessel*," to bear the name of Jesus "before the Gentiles," and experienced the fulfilment of that promise of our Lord, where he says, "If any man will *do His will*, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." God enlightened Paul's *understanding* by a miracle; but this was not *regeneration*; the purification of the *will* is the scripture meaning of the term, and this could not be effected without Paul's *co-operation*. That the young convert *could and did* co-operate in this process, we have his own assertion, where he says, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Should Mr. F. doubt the apostle's *ability* to do all this, hear him again: "I can do *all things* through Christ, which strengtheneth me." His understanding was enlightened in consequence of his *choosing* to serve God; and the same *cause* will always produce the same *effect*. He then "wrought out his own salvation with fear and trembling," giving the glory to God, without whose aid he could have done nothing. "God said, let there be *light*," and Paul *saw* his duty; "God said, let the *earth* bring forth," and Paul *did* his duty, by bringing forth the fruits of righteousness. There is no other regeneration than this, however Mr. F. may flatter himself that he was regenerated in Christ. "By their *fruits* ye shall know them."

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Alas! for our friend Woodworth. What a sad mistake! When we "descend" to an exposition of his arguments, it is called "*ridicule*." Reader, be favourable, and do not arrive at the conclusion, too hastily, that the ridiculous is exposed, and not introduced. When we examine and use his figures, we descend to *sarcasm*; that is, it is a *keen reproach*. "Verbal criticism!" Have we, on any occasion, or at any time, *spoken* of Mr. W.'s productions? Possibly we have done this, without first obtaining liberty to do so. The reader must judge of the degree of criminality in this case; and, if he is anxiously solicitous for the *success* of Mr. W.'s lucubrations, and can find no other cause for judging, pronounce the sentence of our defeat. We have not condescended to hear Mr. W. through, before replying to him. As Mr. W. finds gratification from this source, we hope we shall be excused.

Mr. W. in his *fourth** paragraph, says, "If we remind him of our Lord's own words, 'And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,' the English word *everlasting* is denied being equivalent to *eternal*, although Mr. Fitz knows that they are both translated from one and the same word in the Greek; and that, consequently, if the misery of the wicked be *temporal*, the happiness of the righteous will be so too," &c. Stop, Sir. No trifling. You well know that we have declared again, and again, that the same word is thus variously rendered by our translators of the Bible. Sir, we assert, that the word *αιωνιος*, rendered *everlasting* and *eternal*, in Matt. xxv. has not the same signification which, by common acceptation, has been assigned to the words *everlasting* and *eternal*. We do not approve of your attempt to hide our premises from the reader, and substitute a something more congenial to your wishes. Sir, the happiness of the righteous in another mode of being, will be secured by the resurrection to *immortality and incorruptibility*. The *everlasting*, or *eternal* life, as it is called, is enjoyed in this mode of being, while the recipient is both mortal and corruptible. The *aiunion* punishment (correction) is endured here also. We read, "He that believeth on the Son, *hath* [not shall have at a future time,] *everlasting* life." Also, "He that believeth not is *condemned* [damned] *already*;" not shall be condemned in a *future* state of being. Mr. W. may call this *magic*. This is sooner done than to confute our premises, or to avoid their conclusions.

Mr. W., in his *fifth* paragraph, tried to produce authority for the use of his figures, by a reference to Christ's sayings. Unfortunately for him, Christ never compared men to "owls and vultures." Only on one occasion, Christ used the word *swine*, as applicable in any sense to men, and then in a sense highly figurative. Mr. W.'s assertion, therefore, is incorrect. We trust Mr. W. will not accuse us of blasphemy for speaking of his figures.

Mr. W.'s *sixth* paragraph is a weak effort to avoid our interrogations. We read that the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through *suffering*. His sufferings were confined to this mode of being. Were they too *trifling* to deserve mention? The reader will decide, and assign a cause for leaving our prominent questions unanswered.

Mr. W.'s *seventh* paragraph is another attempt to elude our premises. Sir, have the candour to admit our premises, if you cannot abide the force of their conclusions. We have not said that "*regeneration* was merely the arriving at the knowledge of a certain *fact*." We should like to know if Mr. W.'s opinion of his reader's capacity will authorize his manner of conducting this controversy? Sir, if your readers have eyes, they must see through your management. If this conduct is the effect of ignorance, we pity you. If it is designed, you are highly culpable. Sir, a man is "*born from above*,"

when he is begotten by the "*word of truth*." A man is regenerated in Christ, as follows—"But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened *us* together with Christ (by grace ye are saved) and hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus." (Ephes. ii. 4—6.) Sir, prove, if you can, that a man is *quickened together with Christ*, and not regenerated in Christ, his head,—prove that a man can be *raised with Christ*, and not regenerated. Prove that we have spoken, as you would have your readers believe, of regeneration and being born from above, as one and the same thing. Mr. W. in his *eighth* paragraph attempts to prove that only a part were raised with Christ. Take his own words—"But the apostle does not say that *all* men are risen with Christ. Far from it. He says, 'If, then, ye be risen with Christ, [that is, *if* ye be really awakened from the death of sin and impenitence, as ye profess to be, then] seek those things which are above.' This exhortation would have been superfluous if their regeneration had been already effected." Sir, this will not do. There is no "*if*" in the chapter!!! However, we are glad to catch Mr. W. any where. Sir, we will take you at your word, with your *if*. Reverse the proposition—make the apostle say, 'If, then, ye be *not* risen with Christ, seek *not* those things which are above.' How do you like this? We ask you, Sir, if the raising of Christ, was the "*awakening*" *him* "from the death of *sin and impenitence*?" We are sorry to find Mr. W. trifling in this manner. It appears he admits our definition of the word rendered regeneration.

Mr. W. in his *ninth* paragraph contends, that the "*only* process pointed out in Scripture, to remove impurity, and man is called upon to perform it *himself*;" is, to "*Wash ye*," &c. "Wash thy heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be *saved*." This was addressed to "Jerusalem." Now the stubborn fact is, Jerusalem did not wash, &c. But Jerusalem shall be comforted, for the Book says, "she hath received at the Lord's hand *double* for all her sins." How futile is error! The salvation spoken of, is a temporal salvation from the siege. A prophet beseeches God to "wash him thoroughly from his iniquity, and to cleanse him from his sin." Mr. W. says, "Man is called upon to perform it *himself*;" Paul says, 1 Cor. vi. 11. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the *Spirit* of our God." According to Mr. W. they performed it *themselves*. Again: It is said of God's Messenger, (Christ, Mal. iii. 3.) "*He shall purify the sons of Levi*," &c. How? Ans. "*He shall sit as a refiner of silver*," &c. "*He is like a refiner's fire*," &c. How is this? Ans. The refiner does not purify the metal;—the metal purifies *itself*! Again: Ezek. xxxvi. 25. "*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you*." Tell no more, Sir, of your "*only* process." Again: To *annihilate*, "is to reduce to nothing; to destroy, to annul." Mr. W. will have it that sin, or impu-

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning that which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first.

urity, cannot be annihilated. Was not Christ manifested that he might "destroy the works of the devil?"

Mr. W. in his *tenth* paragraph evades our arguments, by saying, "This notion is too gross an error to merit a moment's attention." The Book says, "I have chosen you in the furnace of affliction." Will Mr. W. answer our repeated question—How can man be saved, unless man is first lost? Sir, you must succumb to the Book, which says, "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Rom. v. 20. You may talk of irresistible conclusions, but, Sir, you cannot alter facts. We do not say, that men sin that grace may abound. This is not their motive, you well know.

Mr. W.'s *eleventh* paragraph is wailing and not argument. Sir, in the original it reads thus—"Ye which have followed me in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." We have omitted the punctuation altogether. Now, Sir, you may decide relative to the following of Christ. It is the time of the regeneration we speak of, and you are careful to waive this, and divert the mind of the reader from the subject under discussion. This will not answer. We ask you, Sir, to prove that men were regenerated before Christ came. Also, to prove that Christ was not regenerated as the Head of every man, and his members, every man with him, when he rose from the dead. Sir, we shall expect you to answer candidly, without evasion, to these inquiries. You will also remember to prove, that the regeneration was before the Son of man sat in the throne of his glory. Give us argument and testimony, we are dissatisfied with your conclusions.

Mr. W.'s *twelfth* paragraph is a weak effort to escape from his absurdities. Sir, you must stick to your text. You shall be accountable for your terms and phrases. You have asserted that thousands would be infinitely more unhappy without hell than with it. Sir, when you substract infinity from a man's suffering condition, there can be no suffering left! Therefore, the reverse or contrary of infinite suffering, must be infinite happiness. Your conclusion, that Satan is unhappy in hell, is a false conclusion. You must first prove that any being can suffer when an infinite suffering is substracted. Sir, to be infinite, it must include every thing as causes, and all are removed. Sir, your syllogism is imperfect. Your major and minor are at loggerheads!

Mr. W.'s *thirteenth* paragraph is a comfortable conclusion that his infinities have overcome all difficulties!

Mr. W. in his *fourteenth* paragraph uses the phrase "verbal criticism," as a weapon, a last resort. Sir, we very civilly asked you a question. Please to answer it? We repeat it—"Is not a freedom of will very imperfect, if it leads the possessor to make a wrong choice?" When you talk of perfect freedom, Sir, we shall conclude the word perfect to mean something. Your manner of disposing of infinities and perfections, will not answer. When we have a man for an opponent, we expect ar-

gument—when we have a child, puerility. We are not surprised that Mr. W. should cherish an antipathy to questions.

Mr. W. in his *fifteenth* paragraph condescends to use his reason, in an endeavour to argue the point. This is honourable. We feel much obliged to him for this disposition to examine the merits of the subject. Mr. W. is of opinion that a "moment's attention to the operation of our own mind, must convince us that man has ability to choose aright," &c. Will Mr. W. admit that the ability must first be given the man from above? Can the gift be called ability, if the recipient is not thereby actually enabled to perform that which is required? If the ability is given for this purpose, and fails of accomplishing it, is not the failure an evidence of its imperfection? We make a distinction between the gift, which is ability or power, and the man who receives it. Now we do not consider that "the understanding of every man teaches him that the exercise of this ability will tend to promote his happiness." This mode of expression would make ability and duty to God, convertible terms. Alas! Sir, for man, he is ignorant. He is blind to his duty and his happiness. He must be taught. The thief is a fool; because he is so devoid of understanding as to suppose that dishonest practices will increase his enjoyment. Our comparison is not "irrelevant to the subject;" for the question is not how man became blind, but how blind man is to receive his sight? It is lamentable that man "hateth the light." He will always hate it until his eyes are opened to see, and an understanding or ability given him to choose the tree of life, instead of the mixed fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Mr. W.'s conclusions in his *sixteenth* paragraph, are partially correct. Now the elect are chosen—the residue are called. Mr. W. however, must not predicate too much on these modes of expression. For we read, "Whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Mr. W. we hope, will admit that these will be saved.

Mr. W. in his *seventeenth* paragraph, considers Paul's case. But he carefully shuns the most prominent questions in the whole paragraph. But we will repeat them. Sir, "Are those who are blind, in prison, bound, &c. perfect in freedom?" We really pity Mr. W. Paul hangs, as a dead weight, on his hands. Sir, will you contend that Paul's "understanding was enlightened in consequence of his choosing to serve God?" Was Paul choosing the service of God, when he persecuted the disciples of Christ? Pray, Sir, be candid, and inform us, What relation existed between Paul's choice, and the ability which you contend God gives man to choose aright? This, properly answered, we think, will prove your view of the subject to be erroneous. Then, Sir, your declaration, that "there is no other regeneration than this, namely, to co-operate as Paul did, will be seen in all its deformity. Sir, your regenerated men are mortal and corruptible. A poor regeneration this.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

To the readers of a periodical publication called the Gospel Herald: I send you through this paper the following observations, in consequence of attending a controversy in Chrystie-street, about the *Devil*. Some there seemed to believe that carnality, the flesh, fleshly lusts, or self-love, was the only Devil; and that whenever one died a natural death, the Devil of that person died. Consequently, that *carnality* was the only death, hell, and devil, we need to fear: and that these should be destroyed. How such ideas can comport with the spirit and words of scripture, I perceive not; but perceive clearly that though the liquor in a glass, is by a trope called the glass, as "*drink this glass*," when only the liquor in the glass is meant; so, though the Devil and Satan, is called Judas, Peter, or carnality, that this was done because his *power*, personally, or by some of his imps or friends, was in Peter, Judas, and the fleshly principle.

When Michael the Archangel, Jude 9, contended with the Devil about the body of Moses, he so respected the Devil's *dignity*, not carnality, that he durst not bring a railing accusation, but said—"The Lord rebuke thee." And in Rev. xii. we read, that it was foretold by Jesus Christ, or his angel, to John, that Michael and his angels, fought with the Dragon and his angels, till there was no more place found in heaven. What *heaven* is this? The starry and natural heaven? No. Was it the natural and moral heaven of ruling powers? I think so. Or was it the heaven of happy spirits and angels, released from flesh and blood, which flesh and blood cannot enter into this heaven?

A deceased prophet was angel to John. Rev. xxii. 8, 9. As the souls of good men deceased, are *good angels*, are ministering spirits, sent forth to the heirs of salvation, is it not rational to believe that the souls of bad men deceased, are *evil spirits*, and become fiends, that possess wicked men and women? These ideas will be corroborated by the following observations, under the head of *Demonology*.

It is astonishing indeed, that some people believe that divination, witchcraft, and witch-doctors exist: and that these diviners and enchanters are inspired and helped by inspiration and powers of infernal spirits, yet do not believe in the inspiration of the Almighty, and assistance of ministering and guardian angels. It is also as astonishing, that a society who believe in the inspiration of the Almighty, and that his spirit moves the saints to preach and pray, and guide them day by day, do, on the contrary, disbelieve, generally, that people can, or do now, act as diviners, wizards, and witches, by the assistance of *demons*, *devils*, or the Prince of Devils. And it is as wondrous to me, that some, who also believe the written Scriptures, disbelieve immediate revelation, whether of God or of the Devil.

ANTI-PYTHONICUS.

REMARKS.

The above appears to be an expression of the opinions of the writer. That he should take things for granted is not surprising. The essay on

Demonology, mentioned above, shall appear in a future Number.

Our correspondent is accommodating in furnishing a solution of the supposed difficulty. He decides that the "*war in heaven*," (Rev. xii.) was a war with the "*national ruling powers*," &c. By consulting Dan. xii. 1. you will learn that *Michael* was the Prince of Daniel's people, the Jews, even *Christ*. The Jewish powers fought with Christ and his angels, (messengers,) and the heaven of ruling power was destroyed. The same Michael (Christ) according to Jude, contended with the same power, the Devil, the Jewish high priest, about the "*body of Moses*," the law, or Mosaic code; not the *dust* which the soul of Moses the prophet once inhabited.

Our correspondent, on the supposition that the spirit of a deceased prophet "*was angel to John*," (Rev. xxiii.) asks, "Is it not rational to believe that the *souls of bad men* deceased, are *evil spirits*, and become fiends that possess *wicked men and women*?" We answer, No! For your wicked souls cannot be in the modern hell, and in the bodies of men in this world at the same time, unless the *body* of a man in this world is a *hell*. Again: If there are men and women who are *wicked* of themselves, your wicked spirits are supernumeraries. Again: The Scripture declares, "*The dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it*." Now if the spirit returns to *God*, it cannot inhabit the body of a wicked man in this mode of being.

It has been suggested, with reference to this hypothesis, that it is bad policy to *hang* very *wicked men*, because their wicked spirits go immediately from the gallows to the *body*, or bodies of wicked men, and act their old crimes over again. It is only increasing their ability to do mischief. It would be better to hang *good men*, and keep the wicked men alive, and confine their bodies and spirits together.

Our correspondent's witches and wizards have nothing to do with us; neither have we any thing to do with them. We have heard of witches, &c. but never saw one. As to devils and demons, we believe they are as imaginary as witches. When we see a devil or a demon, we will then grant him "*a local habitation and a name*," and not before. We mean, *modern devils and demons*. Strictly speaking, every *insane man* is a *demoniac*; and every *wicked man* is a *devil*. It is a man's *misfortune* to be a *demoniac*. It is a man's *fault* to be a *devil*. Of this description of devils, we have seen a number.

We shall defer our remarks on *demonology*, until we publish our correspondent's communication on that subject; when we may give a brief account of the prominent arguments used at the Public Discussion of this subject.

A word, before we close, of the devil's *dignity*. If it was not the office of *high priest*, which the *devil* held, which was respected, our correspondent will confer a favour by explaining what the devil possesses which is so *dignified* as to command respect? That the high priest was a *very devil*, we can prove by Scripture.

HOW CAN THE BLIND SEE?

We recently received a letter from a venerable friend in the state of Maine, containing the following particulars—Our friend and brother in the faith, lately received a letter from a relative, warning him of the falsehood of the doctrine he has embraced, which is, that “God is the Saviour of *all* men, especially of those that believe.” At our aged friend’s request, we publish the letter, &c. as follows—

“My dear Brother, We are hastening to a world of spirits, and to God the Judge of all the world; and to be prepared to meet our Judge, is all our duty while in time. If we should be led by the insinuations of the vile one to believe a *lie*, this cannot justify us before God; and as God and Christ have told us, that deceivers should arise, that would deceive, if possible, even the very elect, let us search the Scriptures, which saith, that “Jesus Christ is the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”

I would ask then, Where is the wisdom of God, in saying, “they should deceive, if possible, even the very *elect*,” if there are none; or if *all* shall be saved? Again: In saving from being deceived, and left to believe a *lie*, that they might be *damned*,—where is his power? But it may be answered, that the *elect* spoken of is Christ. True, and all seed in him. Now if *all* the world was in him, in this sense, where is the wisdom of God manifested in this text?

How necessary it is for us to search the Scriptures. Let this be our pursuit, for the truth’s sake. May God grant it, for Christ’s sake.”

REMARKS.

It is a great pity that a person who is so profuse in exhortations to others to “Search the Scriptures,” should not search for *one’s self*; and at least have sufficient knowledge of them to quote a passage correctly, on which so much is predicated! It has been well said, that if the *blind* lead the *blind*, they will both fall into the *ditch*. In the present case, however, the *blind* would lead those who *see*. We believe our friend, to whom the letter was addressed, has eyes opened wide to the deception which men are practising. This “*blind guide*” is informed, that the Scriptures nowhere declare, that “Jesus Christ is the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” But they declare, (Rom. i. 16.) “I am not ashamed of the *Gospel* of Christ; for *it* is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth.” Your exhortation to “search the Scriptures,” we give you back again. We have searched; and we have found, too, that you are *blind* to their contents. You say, we are going to *God*, &c. The Scripture declares—“In his presence *is* fulness of joy; at thy right hand *there are* pleasures for evermore.” Beware, lest you are “led by the insinuations of the vile one to believe a *lie*.” We believe that it is “God’s *good pleasure* which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one *all things in Christ*.” (Ephes. i. 9, 10.) Is this an insinuation of the *vile one*? We believe in “the *restitution of*

all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” (Acts iii. 21.) Is this a *lie*? We believe that “every knee shall bow, and *every tongue shall swear*, surely shall say, *In the Lord have I righteousness and strength*; to him shall come,” &c. (Isa. xlv. 23.) We believe that Christ spoke the truth, when he said, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life; *no man cometh unto the Father, but by me*.” (John xiv. 6.) Is this believing a *lie*? Are these *vile insinuations*? Are not you a *deceiver*, if you teach a different doctrine; and deny that “God is the Saviour of *all men*?” (1 Tim. iv. 10.)

You ask, “Where is the wisdom of God, in saying, ‘they should deceive, if possible, even the very *elect*,’ if there are none; or if *all* shall be saved?” We answer—There is wisdom in declaring the truth. You prove the propriety of the declaration, by your own conduct. You are trying to deceive. You deny that “God is the Saviour of *all*.” The elect are those, who in this world are “begotten by the word of *truth*.” Paul says, of the word of truth, it is “the *gospel of your salvation*.” (See James i. 8. Ephes. i. 13.) There are none elected to the exclusion of the residue. (See Rom. ix. 6–8; iv. 14–16; xi. 25–32.) Read and search John iii. and you will learn that the condemnation (damnation) is choosing *darkness* rather than light. Also, that the unbeliever is condemned *already*.

Your query relative to all the world being in Christ, is answered by Paul. (See 1 Cor. xv.) “As in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Man shall be raised in the *heavenly image*, &c. Your conclusion is admirable. “How necessary it is for us to search the Scriptures!” We entreat you to search, and learn, that “all the families of the earth shall be blessed.” That Christ was sent to “bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.” Acts iii. 26.

OPPOSITION AT THE SOUTH.

The politeness of a friend at Petersburg, (Va.) has favoured us with a printed copy of a Sermon, delivered in the “Presbyterian Church in Petersburg,” by “The Reverend HENRY RUFFNER, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.” This Sermon is entitled a “Discourse upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.” The Text; “*These shall go away into everlasting punishment*.” Matt. xxv. 46. First clause.” This Sermon was delivered at the “Meeting of the Synod of Virginia.” The occasion of this effort of this “Reverend Master of Arts, and Professor of Languages in Washington College,” is nothing more nor less, than the circulation of EIGHTY Numbers of the GOSPEL HERALD in Petersburg, and thereabouts, every week, and several Sermons delivered in Petersburg, a few months since, by our Br. Mitchell. We presume the author of this “Discourse,” from his titles and distinction, is considered the most able of the “Presbyterian Synod of Virginia.” Therefore, when this modern *Goliath* of orthodoxy, is laid prostrate, and his head cut off, we trust those of little stature will flee to their tents, and leave the field

to the friends of Truth. For the "Stone that was cut out without hands," shall "smite the image upon his feet of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces."

To drop the metaphor—this Discourse shall be answered, and the arguments and conclusions of this Reverend gentleman, weighed in the balance of truth and common sense. We call upon him to keep hold of the plough, and to defend his premises and conclusions; offering him the columns of this Paper for that purpose. We assure him, that opportunity shall be afforded him for displaying more ability and ingenuity in *defending* his Discourse, than was exercised in *composing* it. To prevent even the possibility of objection on the part of the Reverend gentleman and his compeers, we shall publish his Discourse entire, that the reader may be enabled to judge for himself, and do away all suspicion, of any disposition on our part to deal unfairly with our opponents, or to escape from their premises or conclusions.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.
By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN PETERSBURGH.

This Discourse, as you know, was delivered in your Church, at the Meeting of the Synod of Virginia. Solicited by many to permit its publication, I do so, hoping it may be of use in establishing your minds and those of others in a doctrine, which it can profit no man to reject, and which, if revealed, it is no man's right to gainsay, but every man's duty to keep before his eyes, that he may guard his frail nature from sin by the most powerful of all motives. I dedicate this Discourse to you, for whom, the most partial acquaintance has sufficed, to inspire me with the sincerest affection. But I am aware that its publication, though designed to extend its usefulness, will lessen its reputation; because many defects of style, which circumstances do not permit me to amend, will appear in the perusal, which the interest of a first hearing concealed from notice. Wishing your Pastor, yourselves, and your whole city the choicest gifts of Heaven, I commit to you what, I fear your love of truth has induced you to esteem above its merits. HENRY RUFFNER.

REMARKS.

How true is the declaration of Christ! "By their fruits ye shall know them." Christ's ministers testify of Him. His love and affection is all their song. Look at the Preface—consider its analogy with the Discourse, which is written to prove that God is destitute of "sincere affection" for a multitude of his intelligent offspring. But this Reverend gentleman, how is it with him? Take his own words—"I dedicate this Discourse to you, for whom, the most partial acquaintance has sufficed, to inspire ME with the sincerest affection!" Excellent man. His love is so abundant, that the "most partial acquaintance has sufficed" to inspire him with the

"sincerest affection." Alas! my good friends, what a pity it is, that this Reverend gentleman cannot be your judge! He is inspired with the *sincerest affection* for you, at sight! but God, your Judge, who is much better acquainted with you, will torment you for ever! Only consider, if this Reverend gentleman loves you so excessively at first sight, how great would be his love on becoming better acquainted! Wonderful man! But then we have only his word for it; while "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." He also "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." More than this—"God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," &c. We ask, Was God "inspired with the sincerest affection" for the world, (*ἅπαντες, homines universi*, mankind universally,) at the time he "gave his only begotten Son; and has that "sincere affection" become extinct, and deadly hatred rankled in its place? Reader, your soul is the party concerned. Read and rejoice. "GOD IS LOVE. Charity [love] never faileth."

Note—The Reverend gentleman has unwittingly prophesied in his Preface, and declared an important truth. Namely, "I am aware that its [the Sermon's] publication, though designed to extend its usefulness, will lessen its reputation." We shall point out "defects" which no circumstances will enable the writer to amend; and which, no doubt, a "first hearing concealed from notice." Let our opponents, who are the enemies of Christ and his salvation, publish their philippics, and we will engage to make it evident, that their reputation will lessen in proportion as the opportunity of judging of their merits is afforded a discerning public.

We shall commence the publication of the Discourse in our next Number.

GREAT REVIVAL.

The people of the township of C—, who have long been noted for their liberality in supporting missions and missionaries, all sorts of "religious and charitable" societies, and clerical gasconade, have lately been the hopeful subjects of a truly hopeful revival, and are beginning to embrace many notions and ideas of common sense, sound morality, and rational religion! They are discarding the ideas of election and reprobation, and really begin to discover that the Deity is not that partial, unjust monster, that Calvinism makes him, because, forsooth, having detected some of the pious frauds of their clergy, their eyes are opened, and they are fast leaving that church, and joining another. So we go. Plain Truth.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT,

PILATE'S QUESTION.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o'clock.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1823.

NO. 32.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*"

MATT. XXV. 46, First clause.

Whether sinners, who die unconverted and unsanctified, shall suffer endless punishment in Hell; or whether they shall be finally released from all suffering by losing their existence, or by ascending to heaven—is the question which now demands your solemn consideration. I take for granted that such persons will suffer punishment after death. To deny all future punishment is too notoriously unscriptural, unreasonable, and mischievous, to require an argument. But what is to be the duration of the wrath to come? This is the momentous subject of our discourse. It may be considered in two points of view; as a question of reason, and as a doctrine of revelation. As believers in revelation we are bound to receive its decisions, without perverting its language to suit our private notions. Hence I might be excused for omitting any argument founded upon the fallible reason of man. But on this subject especially, our minds are naturally so warped by prejudices, and so prone to flattering delusions, that I think it necessary to make some observations upon the view, which reason ought to take of the question before us. My observations will aim to establish this proposition, namely,

That reason alone cannot determine whether future punishment will be temporary or eternal.

The duration of it depends not upon the reason of man, but the judgment of God. Now the reason of man and the judgment of God may greatly differ in a case of so mysterious a nature. Many things may cause such a difference. I will briefly suggest a few.

1. Our views of the subject are naturally dark and partial. The circle of our knowledge is but a span wide; God at once looks through the universe. We see the fitness and connexion of a few things within our little circle of space and time. God, who has linked all things together, comprehends the whole nature, bearing, and operation of each thing—what influence it will have throughout creation, and throughout eternity. We are liable to mistaken views even of the common things within our sphere of action. How then shall we safely judge the measures of Jehovah's wisdom in administering the affairs of universal, everlasting government?

Does a child fully understand the administration of justice in our civil courts, where men judge men, for merely human and secular purposes? Would you trust the understanding of a child, to frame those penal laws which are to guard your worldly interests? Then why trust your own understanding to determine the penalty of the Divine law, when the glory of God and the general welfare of the everlasting universe are staked upon the force, and authority of that law? There is a measurable proportion between the understanding of a child and a man:—between your understanding and God's there is all the difference between littleness and infinity. Can we measure the evil and guilt of sinning against our God? Can we limit the claims of his justice? Can we decide what way of administering his infinite government, would best answer the united ends of justice and benevolence? Can we look with infallible comprehension through all the relations of all things, trace the operation and consequences of the eternal laws under every possible plan of administration? Can we certainly tell whether temporary or everlasting punishment be best calculated to display infinite justice, and hatred of sin in God, to secure general reverence and obedience to law, to produce a horror of sin in created minds, and finally to secure by proper moral means the greatest quantity of happiness in creation? We cannot pretend to such boundless intelligence. Consequently we are incapable of judging by reason alone, whether God will inflict temporary or eternal punishment in the world to come.

2. God has set before our eyes many examples of the difference between his views and ours. The poet says truly,

The ways of Providence are dark and intricate,
Puzzled with mazes and perplexed with errors,
Our understanding traces them in vain.

What a different course does providence often take from what we would have taken, if events had been under our control! How many things are permitted, which we know not how to reconcile with our ideas of infinite goodness in the Disposer of events! If we, whose goodness is so imperfect, had planned the world, would we have given place to the fall of man, the propagation of a sinful posterity, the prevalence of wickedness, the toils of life, the pains of the body, the sorrows of the heart, the terrors of death—the destroying scourges of flood, fire, and storm—of famine pestilence and war,—sweeping away with equal rage the good and the bad, the vigour of manhood and the tenderness of infancy? Would you have suffered your creation to be a vale of tears, a field of blood, a region of sin

and death? Ah, when you contemplate the weeping, bleeding, dying multitudes around you: then with an aching heart and a bewildered understanding, you find your faith in the infinite goodness of God put to the severest trial: and with deep conviction you exclaim, "Who hath known the mind of the Lord! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" But you gain some relief for your labouring mind, by reflecting that notwithstanding the real and unaccountable evils of this world, enjoyment is mingled with suffering, virtue with vice; the suffering your attribute to unsearchable wisdom and necessary justice; the comforts of life and the sunshine of the soul, to the direct operations of infinite goodness: even the miseries which justice sends, you ascribe to mysterious love working by means above your comprehension. Yet you are utterly incapable of discerning how so much evil is consistent with the purposes of Divine goodness. Convinced by facts and experience, of your total incompetency to ascertain the relation between Divine goodness and human suffering, and to adjust the proportion between Divine justice and the punishment of sinners—will you venture to determine what duration of future evil God may see fit to connect with the impenitent sinner's guilt? If the views and plan of God are so different from what you would have expected, in relation to the evils of this world, with which you are best acquainted; can you see so clearly through the shadow of death into the world to come, as to pronounce that sin and punishment will come to an end? Whatever you may be disposed to think or to hope, may not your reasoning be erroneous, as much now as it would have been, if you had lived and reasoned upon this world before its realities were unfolded?

3. There are two ways of limiting punishment; in degree, and in duration. A man may suffer a great deal in a short time—and he may suffer long yet suffer comparatively little. Two men may be unhappy for an equal time, yet suffer very unequally. Both scripture and reason teach us that sinners will be punished unequally. But does reason alone inform us whether in degree or in duration? Besides; cannot justice keep within proper bounds by limiting the *degree* without limiting the *time* of a transgressor's punishment? God can reduce the degree of positive suffering to an indefinite smallness, so as to make its eternal duration consistent with a just retribution for any measure of offence against the law, and majesty, and goodness of the Infinite Author of our lives and blessings.

And can we affirm that God is bound to restore and sanctify a creature, who has wilfully revolted from him and sinned away a time of grace? If not bound to restore him to holiness, he may abandon him to his chosen wickedness; and if so abandoned, the sinner will be ever adding to his guilt by new transgressions, and ever deserving additional punishment. Can we prove that such will not be the course of things?

Some argue that a temporary sin cannot deserve everlasting punishment. They do not consider that

the greatness of a crime is not measured by the time occupied in its commission, nor the amount of punishment calculated only by the time of its continuance; and that punishment ought to continue as long, at least, as the criminal continues to break the law.

4 We know not the demerit of sin in the sight of God, nor the limits of Divine justice, nor the extent to which it may be good for God to exercise justice upon the despisers of his grace and the enemies of his Son: but these things we *do know*, that the more terrible the penalty of the Divine law, the more forcible is the motive to obedience—the greater the display of the importance of the law, the holiness of God, the evil of sin, the mercy of Redemption, and the value of religion. The more we reduce the terrors of the Lord, the more do we weaken all these considerations; and these considerations respecting the law, holiness, sin, Divine mercy and redemption, are fundamental principles of the Gospel. If the law had no penalty, men would fear no sin, God would manifest no hatred of sin, redemption from sin would prove no mercy in God, no merit in the blood of his Son. The nearer we bring the law to this useless imbecility, the nearer we bring the gospel to an insignificant theory, a mere butt for the blasphemer's scorn, and the villain's contempt;—and which by setting all characters upon an equal footing, would completely deprive fallen man of encouragements to virtue and restraints from the alluring vices of the world.

You see the passions of evil men burst through the opposing fear of eternal punishment: you see the fear of eternal punishment give the first awakening to their consciences, and the first impulse to repentance. May not God, for aught we know, see it necessary to hold up to this and to future worlds, a number of transgressors, suffering eternal evils, in order to reclaim other offenders and to set the most effectual guard around the cause of virtue and happiness?

Once remove the fear of endless punishment; let the threatenings of the Divine law be vague and indefinite; the sinner will soon give loose to his passions and hopes of impunity. His fond delusion will reduce the coming wrath to the measure of his own indulgent views of sin.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

We would respect all men as men, and regard them as brethren. But we do not care a feather for all the distinctions of men, and regard the talents and acquisitions of men according to their use of them. Pretensions come to us very cheap. The Reverend gentleman, who appears as the author of the above Discourse, may figure very well in his college, and in the pulpit; but his *Discourse* is now before us, and we shall examine that as distinctly as possible from its promulgator.

It is his *misfortune*, says charity, to be identified with absurdity. Alas! for him, then, the reader may pity him as much as he pleases. Error originating in misfortune, will poison as certainly as when it comes from the most wayward head, and

vilest heart. And there is something to recommend it.—Let it be labelled in honest characters, nothing extenuated, and the cautious traveller will refuse the draught. We every day grow more sick of *literary beggars*. Better *steal* and done with it. If you can escape conviction, and be honoured as the sire of the bantling, you have your reward. But to *beg*, when the pretensions are foremost—to take things for *granted*, when the power of *proving* is both sung and spoken, is too much. The reader will find a meaning for this before he is done with us, if his patience bears any proportion to his interest in the subject to be examined.

The question, says Mr. R., is, “Whether sinners who die *unconverted* and *unsanctified*, shall suffer *endless* punishment in *Hell*; or,” &c. Well, Sir, if this is the *question*, it is not the *Text*. The *Text* says,

“*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*”

There is not a word of an *endless punishment*, or an *endless Hell* in the *Text*; and we add, neither in the *Bible*! There is not a word of “*dying unconverted* and *unsanctified*.” The question has nothing to do with the *Text*; neither has the *Text* any thing to do with the question. But this is *preaching*; and by a “*Professor of languages*,”—a “*Master of Arts*,”—a “*Reverend*,”—True. This is “*mortar*.” This is “*untempered daubing*.” The “*blind*,” may pronounce it truth. “*Them that sit in darkness*,” may call it light. The *prisoner*, in the “*prison house*,” may say he is at *liberty* to believe it. But we say, Sir, when you prove that men cannot “*go away into everlasting punishment*,” unless they “*die unconverted, unsanctified, and suffer endless punishment in Hell*,” then you can adopt a different mode of expression, and not be obliged to say, “*I take for granted* that such persons will suffer punishment *after death*!”* But, Sir, can you do this? Supposing we shall prove, that men can “*go away into everlasting punishment*,”† without “*suffering endless punishment in Hell*,” how will your Discourse appear then? We shall do this.

As proof of the absurdity of your premises and conclusions, and to show, at once, the futility of your *Greek* criticisms, we will only instance the case of *Jonah* the prophet, whom we shall distinguish, in reference to his disobedience, as the *wicked* prophet. Sir, *Jonah* was punished with “*everlasting punishment*.” He suffered in *Hell* for ever! Take his own words—“*Out of the belly of Hell* cried I, and thou heardest my voice,” &c. “*The earth with her bars was about me for ever*: yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O *LORD* my God.” (*Jonah* ii.) We now dismiss, for the present, the consideration of this prominent feature of your Discourse, and examine your arguments, in their order.

You say, “*To deny all future punishment* is too notoriously unscriptural, unreasonable, and mischievous, to require an argument.” And this de-

claration comes from a “*Professor of languages*!” Sir, if the denial of all future punishment, is productive of much *mischievous*, surely arguments to confute such mischievous premises would be well-timed. We cannot conclude this Reverend gentleman in ignorance of the *Scriptures*, so extremely gross and palpable, as to excuse him altogether for his mode of expression, and finesse in evading difficulties. Sir, *we* will *deny* all punishment *posterior* to the present mode of being. We also deny all power on your part, to prove the denial on ours, to be “*unscriptural, unreasonable, and mischievous*.” We shall examine your *reason*, or reasoning, which you have exhibited in support of the contrary sentiment. If that which you have introduced as *reason*, proves, on trial, to be *folly*, the reader will find conclusions diametrically opposite to your *assertions*.

You ask, “*But what is to be the duration of the wrath to come?*” You add, “*This is the momentous subject of our discourse*.” Sir, we *deny* all “*wrath to come*,” in the sense you take for granted; (for you do not offer any proof,) and call upon you to prove the truth of your premises, before you calculate so largely upon their conclusions. At the time when the declaration was made, which you have forced to become a motto to your Discourse, there was “*wrath to come*,” posterior to the time spoken of; but, in the present mode of being. Take Paul for a witness. He says, of the very Jews, the *nation* of whom were separated and placed on the left hand, (for it is a separation of nations, not individuals,) “*The wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*.” (1 *Thess.* ii. 16.) The prophet says, “*Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord’s hand double for all her sins*.” (*Isa.* xl. 2.) Christ declares, in the context to your text, “*For there shall be great tribulation, [How great?] such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be*.” (*Matt.* xxiv. 21.) Thus, Sir, the wrath came, in the past tense, “*to the uttermost*,” and in the present mode of being. Here is *proof*, (not assertion) and argument, (not taking it for granted,) that “*a denial of future punishment*” is *not* unscriptural.

You say, Reverend Sir, (for we choose to address ourselves to the author of the Discourse,) of the *duration* of the wrath to come, “*It may be considered in two points of view; as a question of reason, and as a doctrine of revelation*.” Sir, you must stop. We have proved the wrath, which you say is *to come*, that it has already come—it is *past*! Now, Sir, the momentous question is, What *was* the *duration* of the wrath which is *past*?* Let a prophet speak—“*Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, [How long? Only a little moment!] until the indignation be overpast*.” (*Isa.* xxvi. 20.) If the indignation is to be *endless*, as

* That is, posterior to the present mode of being. We believe men “*suffer punishment after death*,” for “*to be carnally minded is death*.” *Rom.* viii. 6.

† According to the full import of the original.

* The wrath is past, altogether, considering its primary application, agreeably to Christ’s prophecy. The Jews, however, are concluded in unbelief, that they all may be saved. See *Rom.* xi. 32.

you, Sir, assert, it can never be *overpast* ! Again : " In a *little wrath* I hid my face from thee for a moment ; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee," &c. (Isa. liv. 8.) " He will *not* always chide, nor keep his anger for ever." (Psa. ciii. 9.) " I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wrath ; [Why ?] for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls I have made." (Isa. lvii. 16.) Sir, we give you *God's* testimony, to prove your doctrine of *endless misery* abominable and unscriptural. Sir, punishment cannot be *endless* ; for God declares, the consequence would be, that the *spirits* of men, the *souls* he has made, would *fail* before him, should he be "*always wrath*." Great God, how harmonious is *thy truth* ! Thou art "merciful and gracious, *slow to anger*, and *plenteous in mercy*." Thou "wilt *not* always chide ; neither keep anger for ever." Thou "knowest our frame ;" thou "rememberest that we are dust." (Psa. ciii.) Sir, here are *reasons* why punishment shall not be *endless*. Here is Scripture, the unequivocal declarations of *God Himself*, to prove the falsehood of your doctrine.

You say, Sir, "As believers in revelation we are bound to receive its decisions, without *perverting* its language to suit our private notions." Sir, your "private notion" is, that a part of mankind will be made *endlessly* miserable. Your public labours and endeavours are to propagate your private notions, and poison the mental atmosphere with the pestiferous effluvia of your opinions. You represent God in the character of an almighty tyrant ; and men as the fearful recipients of his cruelties. Our "*God is love*." Unchangeably the same ; the Father, Benefactor, and Saviour of his offspring.

You, Sir, conclude, that "*Reason alone* cannot determine whether *future* punishment will be *temporary* or *eternal*." You therefore say, you "think it necessary to make some observations upon the view, which *reason ought* to take of the question before us !" You add, "The duration of it [punishment] depends not upon the reason of man, but the judgment of God." Let us examine these assertions. First : Reason cannot determine. Second : The duration of punishment does not depend on reason. Third : It is necessary to consider what reason ought to view of the subject. Fourth : The duration of punishment depends upon the *judgment* of God. Sir, your premises are fairly stated. Look at them. How, on your own confessions and assertions, ought we, or can we, arrive at truth in the subject before us ? Reason will not answer. Reason has nothing to do with the consequences. Reason ought to view the subject somehow, or in some way. God's judgment, alone, decides the whole question or subject. Then, we say, and so, we think, all must say, let us inquire, What is *God's judgment* in this subject ? Ans. "Say among the heathen the *LORD* reigneth : the *world* also shall be *established* that it shall not be moved : he shall *judge* the people *righteously*." (Psa. xcvi. See the whole Psalm.) "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name ? for *thou only art holy* : for *all nations* shall come and worship before thee ; for thy *judgments* are made manifest." (Rev. xv. 4.) Christ

says, (John xii.) "*God's commandment is life*," &c. Sir, here you have God's judgment. The duration of punishment depends on God's judgment. We see the triumphant truth, that God's judgment brings all punishment and suffering to an end ! Sir, how true is your declaration ! "Now the reason of *man*, and the judgment of God may greatly differ in a case of so mysterious a nature." You then add, "Many things may cause such a difference ;" and proceed to state a few, as you say. Your first is all-sufficient. Namely—"Our *views* of the subject are naturally *dark and partial*." Sir, we must believe you speak the truth in this instance. Your confession is correct. Your views of the subject of man's punishment, and God's judgments, etc. are "*naturally dark and partial*." We have your own word for it ; and independent of this testimony, your premises and conclusions are incontestable evidence. Are we to receive your "*dark and partial* views ?" What do you mean, Sir ? You have presented yourself as a *teacher*. What do you teach ? We know you teach an *unmerciful* doctrine ; at the bare recital of which, humanity shudders. But, *how* do you teach ? Your "*views are dark and partial*." Your reason, you confess, "cannot determine." Also, that "the subject does not depend on *your* reason." Finally, that all depends on *God's judgment*. Sir, the balance is prepared. Will you be weighed ? You shall be. Sir, the balance of God's judgment is against you. What can you do ? You must lie down in sorrow.

You proceed, with your "*dark and partial views*"—you ask, "Why trust your own understanding to determine the penalty of the Divine law," &c. ? Sir, Why trust *your* own understanding ? You proceed, and decide, that it requires "*BOUNDLESS INTELLIGENCE* to tell whether temporary or everlasting punishment be best calculated to display infinite justice, and hatred of sin in God, to secure general reverence and obedience to law, to produce a horror of sin in created minds, and finally, to secure by proper moral means, the *greatest* quantity of happiness in creation." This is a sweeping conclusion. How will it suit your declarations ? Are you in possession of "*boundless intelligence* ?" You add, "Consequently we are incapable of judging, by *reason alone*, whether God will inflict temporary or eternal punishment in the world to come." Sir, can you be capable of judging, according to your own conclusion, unless you possess "*boundless intelligence* ?" Can you possibly possess boundless intelligence, or any quantity of certain intelligence in this matter, so long as your "*views of the subject are naturally dark and partial* ?" You must answer in the negative. There is no escape.

Having your own confession, Sir, that you know very little, and nothing certain, we will examine, with some attention, the *pretended* knowledge which you have exercised, and offered to your readers. You appear to be ready to admit, and even to contend, that the endless wretchedness of a part of mankind, may be, or is, "best calculated to display *infinite justice*," &c. and "to secure by proper

moral means the greatest quantity of happiness in creation!" Sir, do you wish to be understood to say, that *endless misery*, or, as you express it, "*everlasting punishment*," is the "*proper moral means* to secure the greatest quantity of happiness?" If this is true, will not the *extent* of the means correspond with the *quantity* of happiness? Sir, if your views are not naturally so "dark and partial" that you cannot see at all, you must see that, according to your mode of reasoning, if *all* are made the subjects of everlasting punishment, the greatest quantity of happiness will be secured. This conclusion rests altogether on the truth of your assertion, that everlasting punishment is a "*moral means*" to secure happiness! The same conclusion is the inevitable result of the consideration of your *infinite justice*. Infinite justice exists only in proportion to the extent of your *moral means*! The moral means must be infinite in all senses, or the justice is not infinite. Every thing relative to God's character depends on the extent of your moral means.

The *seventh* paragraph in your Discourse, commences by interrogating—"What a different course does Providence often take from what we would have taken, if events had been under *our* control!" Where, think you, would be the mighty difference? O, Sir, read this paragraph (including the 8th and 9th pages of your Discourse) again. Consider the "*field of blood*." An apostle asks the question—"From whence *wars* and *fightings* among you?" Sir, will you join with the apostle, and admit that they come of *men's lusts* "that war in their members?" (James iv. 1.) Sir, what course would men pursue, could they control events? They are now the authors of all the mischief in the world. Beware how you "charge God foolishly." The "wisdom that is from above, is pure, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy," &c. Sir, you conclude a terrible catalogue of woes, saying, "The *suffering* you attribute to unsearchable *wisdom* and necessary *justice*;" &c. "even the miseries which justice sends, you ascribe to mysterious *love* working by means above your comprehension." We really wish to know if you are serious, Sir, in your remarks and conclusions? Sir, "The wages of *sin* is death." One of two conclusions is irresistible—Justice consists in preventing suffering, and producing happiness, or it consists in producing suffering, and preventing happiness. Sir, take your choice. Pray be consistent. How can *love* influence *justice* to send *endless* misery? Sir, words will and must have a meaning. Be cautious how you use them, or they will prove an edged tool, and cut your fingers.

We are astonished, that any man should confess his "*utter incapacity* of discerning how so much evil is consistent with the purposes of Divine goodness," when he is striving with all his might to make it appear, that endless evil, misery, wretchedness inexpressible, is not only consistent with God's purpose, but essential to the very accomplishment of his purposes. Sir, the day for *polemical jargon* and *religious nonsense*, has gone by. The time has been, when a man's reputation for piety and wisdom, depended upon his absurdity; when the outrageous

perversion of reason and common sense, would exalt him in the opinion of the vulgar, and his claim to knowledge and parts, rested on his obscurity in expression, and the inconsistency of his conclusions. But now, the times are altered. Sir, we beseech you, tell us no more of your folly and insignificance, if you pretend to wisdom and might. Either sit down in the shade of your imbecility, and quietly pass the time of your sojourning here, or show pretensions, honestly supported, that you can be trusted with the care of conclusions. Sir, you are "*totally incompetent* to ascertain the relation between Divine goodness and human suffering;" on your own confession. With this confession in your mouth, you appear as the advocate of "human suffering" to an interminable duration, on the plea, that the relation between Divine goodness and human suffering is such, that the greatest quantity of happiness will be secured by it!!!

In your *eighth* paragraph, (under your 3d general head) you ask, "Cannot justice keep within proper bounds, by limiting the *degree*, without limiting the *time* [duration] of a transgressor's punishment?" Surely, this is an attempt at accommodation. Only grant us the *time*, let us punish the sinner endlessly, and we will make his condition pretty *comfortable*. In truth, we are glad to see one spark of mercy fly from the work shop of Calvin! This will not do. God "will not be always wrath." You add—"God can reduce the degree of positive suffering to an indefinite smallness, so as to make its eternal duration consistent with a just retribution for any measure of offence against the law," &c. If we admit this, can you prove that God will do so? To argue that sinners will suffer endlessly, because God has *power* to inflict an endless punishment, will not answer. "God is love." We shall argue, that all men will enjoy endless happiness, because God is able to confer endless happiness. This conclusion is in harmony with the perfections of *love*.

You then ask, "Can we affirm that God is bound to restore and sanctify," &c. You then conclude, that "if God is not bound," &c. "he *may* abandon," &c. This is conjecture only. Sir, God *loves* the world. It is the nature of love to seek the happiness of its object. Is not this reasonable? Is it not Scriptural? Is it not better than mere conjecture? Sir, we have proved by God's testimony, that he will not abandon the sinner endlessly. Your conclusion, that "punishment ought to continue as long, at least, as the criminal continues to break the law," we shall not dissent from. It is declared, "All shall be taught of God. His law will be written in the heart." (Heb. viii.)

Under your general head, number 4, and *eleventh* paragraph, you modestly confess, you do not know the demerit of sin in the sight of God. As a matter of course, then, you do not know the *penalty*. All your former reasoning on this particular, is set aside by this single confession. But, all at once you recover your strength, and say, "But these things we *do know*, that the more terrible the penalty of the Divine law, the more forcible is the motive to obedience." Stop, Sir. Recollect, your "views are

dark and partial." You have forgotten yourself again. Reason cannot decide. You do not know any thing about it, on your own confession. Sir, we have too much charity to disbelieve your repeated confession of your ignorance. All your deductions are qualified by your confession of mental imbecility. You must not declare positively, until you renounce and abjure your previous conceptions. We ask you, How do you *know*, that the "display of the holiness of God, the evil of sin, the mercy of redemption, and the value of religion," are in exact proportion to the terribleness of "the penalty of the Divine law?" You contradict, in the most palpable manner, your own system. You have once decided, that "God can *reduce* the degree of positive suffering to an *indefinite smallness*." But, forgetting yourself, you declare the contrary; making the whole of God's plan of redemption, and even his own holiness, depend on a terrible penalty! You ought to consider, that "*you know*," that "the more we *reduce* the terrors of the Lord, the more do we weaken all these considerations!" Sir, is the consideration that the penalty of the law is terrible, "a fundamental principle of the Gospel?" Where can be the mercy of redemption to you, if the penalty of the law is so terrible as to exclude you from that mercy? Your reasoning is puerile. You betray extreme ignorance of the Scriptures. Study your Bible, and you will learn, that "by the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." That the law cannot disannul the promises. (Gal. iii.) The Scriptures must decide. Read Deut. xxviii. and learn, that the whole penalty of the law is confined in its infliction to the *present* mode of being. But you, Sir, make the Gospel dependent upon the law. The law can never be fulfilled, and we are assured it shall be, until *all* men love God and their neighbour. "*Love* is the fulfilling of the law." Where did you learn your lesson, which you assert you *know*? Explain how the law can be fulfilled by the perpetuation of *hatred*, of misery and woe. The Scriptures declare, "The law of the Lord is perfect; converting the soul." Will you deny this? Do you *know* that the *penalty* of the law, and not the *law* itself, is a "fundamental principle of the Gospel?" Dare you assert, that the law, instead of converting the soul, will make the soul endlessly miserable? So long, Sir, as you confessed ignorance, and acknowledged your views to be "partial and dark," we were disposed to account favourably for your blunders. But now, when you assert that you *know*, we demand unequivocal testimony—sound arguments, reason, and truth. You must learn to observe distinctions between things and principles of contrary natures, uses, powers, and applications. Remember, the *penalty* of the law, make it as terrible as you please, is not the foundation of the Gospel. The law itself, was given four hundred and thirty years after the promise was made to Abraham. "The law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto [until] Christ," &c. (See Gal. iii.)

Your *twelfth* paragraph is the consummation of ignorance. You acknowledge that the "passion of *evil* men burst through the opposing fear of eternal punishment." You then conclude it may be necessary to punish eternally, to "reclaim other offenders, and to set the most *effectual* guard around the cause of virtue and happiness." Astonishing! First decide that the fear of *eternal* punishment is *ineffectual*, and then consider it as the most *effectual guard*." Why, Sir, you are running mad with absurdity. Can it be possible, that a man in the nineteenth century can be found, and found a professed *teacher* in a college too, so astonishingly ignorant of religion and philosophy! What! Is *endless misery* the most "effectual guard" around the cause of *virtue and happiness*? Shall the power, wisdom, and goodness of the great JEHOVAH, fail of their influence, and all the emanations of love prove ineffectual in their operations, the Spirit that dwelt in Jesus be silent and confounded, and *misery* alone, prove efficient? Horrible beyond description, is this conclusion! Astonishing, beyond comparison, this ignorance! God's servant besought men "by the *mercies* of God." The voice of inspiration declares, "The *goodness* of God leadeth to repentance." Fear of punishment may deter men from the commission of crime; but *love*, alone, can stimulate them to virtue. Repentance can never consist in fear of the *consequences* of sin, but always in *hatred* of it. "Virtue and happiness," are guarded by love. A tyrant, and a tyrant alone, by *fear*.

Your assertion in your *thirteenth* paragraph is without a shadow of proof, and as little reason. You have decided that passion will "burst through the opposing *fear* of eternal punishment." And here you declare, "Once remove the *fear* of endless punishment; let the threatenings of the Divine law be vague and indefinite; the sinner will soon give loose to his passions," &c. How puerile! Sir, does it follow, that the threatenings of the Divine law will be *vague and indefinite*, unless the punishment be *endless* in duration? It would be offering an insult to your judgment, to charge you with this conclusion. And you, Sir, have adopted it voluntarily! Let the sinner's "fond delusions reduce the coming wrath to the measure of his own indulgent views of sin." Sir, facts are stubborn. You are a *sinner*. Deny it, if you dare. How have you estimated the "coming wrath?" The conclusion of your discourse answers—"The worm of conscience, the fire of wrath, the blackness of despair, devils, liars, traitors, murderers, blasphemers, rage, terror, remorse, weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth. O, eternity, eternity! wilt thou never end? No, never, never." This, Sir, is your "indulgent views of *sin*." Of *sin*, did we say? Pardon our waywardness, Sir, God and your conscience knows best your view of *sin*. 'Tis your view of the *punishment* for sin. Read, Sir, and tremble. If you are insincere, the portion of the hypocrite awaits you. If you are sincere, and believe the punishment for sin, to be the tremendous infliction of congregated horrors, which you have enumerated, hear your doom. You have sinned—God is no respecter of persons—

"Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to render unto every man as his work shall be." Your work has been sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." (To be continued.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

A SHORT SERMON.

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink."—John vii. 37.

There were three yearly feasts among the Jews. The feast of the Passover, instituted at the time the children of Israel went out of Egypt; when the angel passed over the houses of the children of Israel, where the blood of the lamb was sprinkled, and all the first born of the Egyptians were slain. This feast was typical of Christ the Lamb of God, who is called our Passover, who was sacrificed for us: to deliver us by his blood from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. This feast was observed in the beginning of the Jewish year, to commemorate their deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

Another feast appointed by the God of Israel for his people to observe, was the feast of Pentecost. This was kept at the beginning of the harvest, or first-fruits, which they were to take as a thank-offering to God, by which the whole harvest, or lump was blessed. As the Scriptures observe, if the first-fruit be holy, the lump is also holy. The feast was typical of the outpouring of the spirit, when the first-fruits from among the Jews and Gentiles were gathered to the faith of Christ. It was at this feast of Pentecost that the holy Spirit was poured out upon the apostles, and three thousand were converted under one sermon.

The third feast was the feast of Tabernacles, which was kept eight days, beginning and ending with the sabbath. On the last of these days, called in our text the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink." This feast was kept at the end of the year, when the Jews had gathered in their harvest. At which time they built booths of the branches of trees, and dwelt in them all the days of the feast. This feast was typical of the ingathering of all nations to Christ, in the end of the world, when they shall all know the Lord.

Jesus' standing and crying on this great day of the feast, as in our text, may teach that he will, in the latter ages of the world, more especially, call the children of men to embrace his free salvation; so that all the thirsty souls will come to him and drink of the water of life, and thirst no more after the unsatisfying waters of error and strife, but shall receive the pure water of life, which flows from the throne of God and the Lamb. He that drinketh of this water shall never thirst, but it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Wherever the gospel is preached in purity, it may be said that Jesus is thereby inviting the thirsty children of men to believe in him, that they may find rest to their souls, and receive the water of life, which has the three following excellent qualities:

1. The salvation of the gospel may be compared to water, because of its *cleansing* nature. The souls of men are defiled with sin, but this water of life cleanseth the soul from all iniquity. This is the fountain set open for sin and uncleanness, spoken of by the prophet. 2. Water has a *refreshing* quality. So has the gospel of salvation. Too many, however, like the ancient Israelites, are guilty of evils; they forsake God, the fountain of living waters, and hew out cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water. The Psalmist expresses different feelings; "As the heart panteth after the water brooks, so, O Lord, our soul thirsteth for thee." 3. Water has a quality to make *fruitful*. It is by the rain and dew from heaven the fruits of the earth are brought forth. As the rain cometh down from heaven and watereth the earth, so it shall be with God's word, it shall not return void, but accomplish the thing whereunto it is sent. The blessed fruits of the spirit are brought forth, by means of the water of life, which Jesus gives. With joy let all come, and draw water from the wells of salvation.

The souls of men are so made that they desire happiness; and all are seeking it in some way or other. But nothing can so refresh, and cleanse, and make the soul fruitful in the works of righteousness, as the water which Christ gives those who come to him.

Let us then come to Jesus, if we thirst, and he will give freely. For his invitation runs in the following manner—"Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." This water of life, like the river which flowed out from the threshold of the Lord's house, brings life wherever it comes; and like it, was found at first to the ancles, then to the knees, then to the loins, then a river to swim in, which could not be passed over. So the salvation of the gospel has been measured from age to age, and found deeper and deeper, until finally all flesh shall see this salvation of God.

From the American Eagle, published at Litchfield, Connecticut.

We must this week lay aside every weight and the wheels that so easily beset us, and attempt to show how the clergy came by the monied and moral power they now possess.

But it may be best to inquire what power, what influence they do actually possess. And it is believed that by way of general remark, it may be said, and assumed as a fact, that they, to say nothing of the funds already acquired, now hold in their teeth the *heart-strings*, and in their fingers the *purse strings* of seven or eight millions of people—of more than half the number of every man, woman, and child in America! And what is still more, they have arrayed this immense moral power, together with that power of *powers*, the *press*, against the other portion of the population, to bring by enticement, persuasion, interest, or denunciation, the heart-strings and the purse-strings, of this other portion, into the same clerical keeping. An array of *mental effort*, of *mental forces*, for the *collection of money*, of *accumulation of funds*, never before

in operation, concentrated to a single object, in any kingdom or empire since the mother of mankind plucked the apple in the garden, where man and his empire began. Such a command of such a number of *free wills*—such a command of such a “wilderness of free minds,” directed to a single object, and that object in no way concerned in the temporal welfare or safety of a single one of them, was never before wielded to a single point, in any age, or in any nation.

Over the whole surface of America, from the white-cap mountains in Maine, to the further plains of Louisiana—from the shores of the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains beyond the Mississippi, there is not the dwelling of a white man that has escaped the entrance of this spirit of mammon for Missions:—Bidden or unbidden, welcome or unwelcome, it has entered. In this whole inhabited face of America, name, if you can, the dwelling, from the proud tall mansion of the city, to the thatched hut of the forest, whose door-post has contained a sign of the pass-over, or exemption to the entrance of the mercenary dun, *money, money, money*, to “evangelize the world.” You have heard its calls as incessant and as perpetual as the gnawing of the vulture at the vitals of Prometheus.

Will credulity itself warrant the belief, that the pure and holy lamp of religion, of vital piety, has continued to burn in the bosom of those who have been so incessant in their demands for more, more, of the *god of this world*? Think ye that the glory of Jehovah, and spread of His Gospel, has been the sole object they had in view to attain it?

But to proceed. *Priest* and *Levite*, Press and Pulpit, Altar and Sacrament, high places and low, public and private, have all been put in requisition for the attainment of more, more of the *mammon of unrighteousness*. Cash, cash, is now openly announced from the Pulpit and Press, the *sineews* of the *Gospel*, as it always has been the *sineews* of *War!!!* O Jesus! where are thy followers straying?

And besides these, the fire-side, the nursery, and pillow, have been made places of assignment, that in the endearment of caresses, the children, the wife, might wring from the father and the husband, his hard earnings, which the pulpit and press had failed to obtain. Till, in short, as first remarked, they hold in their teeth the *heart-strings*, and in their fingers the *purse-strings* of more than seven or eight millions of people.

Think ye that the meeting and combining of five, ten, or fifty clergymen in the commencement, has produced all this? As well may you say, that the meeting of five, ten, or fifty Chiefs of the natives on the western shore of Africa, under the equator, and saying to the wind, “westward ye shall perpetual blow,” and to the wave, “westward ye shall perpetual roll,” is the philosophical cause of the Trade-winds and the gulf-stream on the Atlantic, as to pretend the combination of the priest-hood was, *a priori*, the cause of all this.

No, you must look to a cause deeper than that. You must search for it in the cause which in heaven made the angels rebel. And besides the Arch

Tempter it required but one man and one—to set it in motion. The Bible itself will prove this.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION.

The Genesee Branch of the Western Association of Universalists, convened, agreeably to adjournment last year, Sep. 23, 1823, at Pittsford, Monroe county, (N. Y.)

Three new Societies were received into fellowship. Brs. J. S. Thompson, and J. Holiday, were received into fellowship, and ordained to the work of the ministry.

BLACK RIVER ASSOCIATION.

The Black River Association of Universalists convened in Ellisburgh, on Wednesday, the 8th October, 1823.

Br. Cornelius G. Parsons was chosen Moderator, and brother Warren Skinner, Clerk.

Three new societies were received into fellowship, and our brother Abner Wood, admitted into the ministry of reconciliation. The Association was in session two days, and six discourses were delivered.

NEW CHURCHES.

The present year adds *ten* to the number of Universalist Churches in the United States.

From the Petersburg Intelligencer.

GOSPEL MELODIES.

“FATHER FORGIVE THEM.”—*Gospel.*

“Forgive them, Father,” Jesus cried,

“They know not what they do,”

And praying this our Saviour died,

And praying died for you.

By you was Jesus crucified,

By you he bled, by you he died!

’Midst all his pain, amidst disgrace,

By deepest tortures riven,

His anxious soul still seeks a place

For his lov’d flock in Heaven!

“As for my murderers,” thus he cried,

“Forgive them, Father,” bow’d and died!

How Heaven’s archangels hover’d round,

With liquid, melting eyes,

And while loud thunders rent the ground,

They bore him to the skies;

But, oh! how soothing, sweet he sigh’d

“Forgive them Father,” ere he died.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—JOHN XIX. 30.

The “Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth,” will meet at Tolerton’s Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o’clock.

[P] We find it necessary to defer publishing the essay on Demonology, for a short time. B. H. shall appear in our next Number. Brother Woodworth is not forgotten. The request to offer a comment on the Parable of the wheat and tares, Matt. xiii. shall receive attention.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1823.

NO. 33.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from page 243.)

Having thus disposed of the *second* portion of Mr. F.'s REPLY to our former remarks, we now proceed to investigate the *third* and last portion of that reply, as copied above, from the Gospel Herald of October 11.

And here we find, in the *first* paragraph, the following assertion: "There is such a thing as God's making man good and happy without man's *co-operation*. And this is quite as reasonable as to suppose that God could make man at the beginning without man's *joint labour*. Mr. W.'s conclusion, therefore, is a false one." Here is another specimen of Mr. F.'s *logic*. No action can be predicated of a *non-existence*; it is, therefore, ridiculous to talk of man's *acting* before he *exists*. Our business is with man, as a living and active being, who has fallen, by his own inventions, from the upright state in which he originally stood by creation. Spiritual things can always be illustrated by natural things, and there is a striking analogy between spiritual and natural maladies. When a man (originally in good health) has become diseased by an indulgence of vicious habits, is it not necessary for him to *co-operate* with his physician, in order to be restored to health? Does he not thus *co-operate* when he takes the medicine which the physician prescribes, abstains from such indulgences as he prohibits, and regulates his diet and regimen according to medical directions? This is all the *co-operation* we contend for; and, without such *co-operation* on the part of the patient, all the benevolent wishes, professional advice, earnest entreaties, and unremitting exertions of the physician will, and must be, wholly unavailing. Does it imply any imperfection in his skill or science to say that he *cannot* perform that cure alone, which he might have effected with the patient's *co-operation*? The answer is plain, and the application obvious.

In the same paragraph Mr. Fitz says, "Man is only the recipient of God's goodness, who affords him *means* and *opportunity*, and finally raises him incorruptible and immortal, without any assistance from man's power." We would again ask, what are these *means* and *opportunity* afforded for, if man can do nothing? As a recipient, every man receives goods from the Lord, according to his several ability, some five talents, some two, and some one. But is not every one required to improve these talents? and is not every slothful servant condemned to outer darkness for *not* improving them, instead of being made ruler over many things? The parable is familiar to every one; how can it be reconciled with the doctrine which Mr. F. labours so zealously

to establish? Mr. F. concludes this paragraph by asking, "Do you ever *compel* your children to act differently from their own choice? If you do, you are, on your own confession, palpably absurd." We are confident that not one of our readers will admit this inference, when he reflects that *rationality* is what alone renders the will *free*. Idiots and brutes are consequently not free agents, and man only becomes so by the gradual expansion and perfection of his rational principle as he advances from infancy to adult age. During this progressive state, the rationality of the parent or guardian must be exercised for the child, until that of the latter becomes formed and matured. Freedom of will implies a knowledge of right and wrong, and a positive conviction of their ultimate effects. Mr. F. may *compel* his child to go to school, without any absurdity on his own part; but can he *compel* him to *love* his studies, and to find *pleasure* in literary pursuits? Let him make the experiment, and we think he will prove himself to be palpably absurd. And can "children of a larger growth" be *compelled* to *love* virtue, when they have, through a long life, made vice the idol of their worship? Reason and Scripture both answer—No!

In the next paragraph Mr. Fitz says as follows: "Mr. W. to illustrate his hypothesis, we presume, asserts, that "With the great I AM, the *past*, *present*, and *future* form one eternal NOW, on which *foreknowledge* cannot be predicated." Although this declaration (adds Mr. Fitz) is one which is monstrously absurd, we will admit it, and reason accordingly. Mr. W.'s vultures and owls are *now* vultures and owls, &c. "always were vultures and owls, without beginning and without end." Here is another specimen of Mr. F.'s *logic*, as absurd as either of the preceding. We did not say, that "with vultures and owls, the past, present, and future form one eternal now," but with God; that Infinite Mind, in which is no shadow of change, of which no such thing as *succession* can possibly be predicated. Were it otherwise, his mind would not be infinite. If one idea ever did exist *before* another, in the divine mind, there must have been a *beginning* to such *succession*, and, of consequence, a beginning to God, which it is blasphemy to suppose. So that Mr. F.'s playing and punning upon the word *now*, amounts to nothing—"less than nothing, and vanity."

In the same paragraph, Mr. F. asks, "how many hells are there?" Let him open the first number of this magazine, at the *eighth* page, article vi. sec. 4. and he will find an answer, with the *scripture proofs*. In the same number, page 5, article iv. he

will find an answer to his next question respecting *redemption*. We do not contend that the hells shall conquer man, so far as to hold him in their bondage, but that man *willingly and voluntarily* yields himself a captive to them.

The remainder of Mr. F.'s *second* paragraph is made up of syllogisms, each of which stands tottering upon one leg.

In the *third* paragraph of this portion of his *REPLY*, Mr. F. calls our attention to the future destiny of all who die in infancy. This is quickly answered. They have not lived in the *practice*, nor died in the *love* of evil, consequently, have not made any hereditary propensity to evil, their own. It is adult man, who has *confirmed himself in evil*, that "can never be receptive of heavenly felicity until he is *regenerated*." We have just before shown, that *infants are not free agents*, because they are destitute of *reason and rationality*. They are ignorant of evil, and consequently do not love it; they have not "sought out many inventions," therefore, of "such is the kingdom of heaven." [See our first number, page 9, sec. 2.]

Now let Mr. Fitz answer a question concerning children. He says, "Unless man had strayed in sin and error, and learned, by bitter experience, the evil of transgressing the commands," &c. Pray tell us, Sir, did all the infants that have departed this life since the fall "stray in sin, and error, and learn, by bitter experience?" Perhaps Mr. F. will say that they did all this, "in the aggregate," in Adam. But how can Adam's "bitter experience" benefit a child of a week old? This leads us back to our old question, which Mr. F. has heretofore so "ingeniously evaded answering:" "Why does God permit innocent children to suffer in *this* world? Is the temporal suffering of an infant of one, two, or three months old, intended as a correction to produce reformation?" Is such suffering rewarding the infant according to his *works*? What works has it performed? Has it done or neglected to do that for which rewards and punishments (say temporal) are promised or threatened? Let us have no more evasions, but a *definite* answer to these simple questions—or an honest confession of inability to give it.

Mr. F.'s *fourth* paragraph is devoted to an exhortation, in which he recommends us to confess the truth of his doctrine! All that we can honestly confess is, that until we gave it this slight investigation, we had no idea that the whole system was so monstrously absurd as we find it to be.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. F.'s *REPLY*, is another *evasion* of the *three questions* which we have so repeatedly asked him to solve. The *Postscript* he alludes to, throws no light on the subject; for in that he merely says, that "to speak evil of God," and to "accuse" him of cruelty, is "the height of *impious* blasphemy." God forbid that we should be guilty of this impious crime. But if this *assertion* prove any thing, it proves *too much* for Mr. F.'s purpose. We have requested Mr. F. to account for the *present* suffering of the *innocent*, but instead of doing so, he merely says it would be blasphemy to consider it as cruelty on the part of

God. We contend that he who dies in the love of evil, cannot enjoy the felicity of heaven to all eternity: Mr. F. does not hesitate to say, that if this be the case, it is wanton cruelty on the part of Deity. We leave the reader to decide on the charge of blasphemy. We know that *temporal* sufferings are *not* an evidence of cruelty, and consequently we do not speak evil of God. Mr. F. does not know that *all* men will enjoy heavenly felicity hereafter, and (allowing him to be mistaken in opinion) *does* speak evil of God, by saying the permission of *hell* is an evidence of his "ignorance, indifference, or impotence."

It is true that Mr. F. has, at length, answered one of our *subsequent* questions, "Does God permit the innocent to suffer for the guilty?" in the affirmative, but offers no argument in illustration. He says that Christ suffered "on account of guilty men," but immediately adds, that "God will never permit his innocent creatures to suffer the *punishment* due to the guilty, for any sins the guilty has committed, to release them from their just punishment." In this remark we agree with him: but do inform us, sir, in your next, in what manner mankind are benefited by the sufferings of Christ, and if those who lived and died previous to the incarnation are sharers with us in these benefits, or whether their temporal or eternal states were affected at all by the subsequent work of redemption.

POSTSCRIPT. After all that has been said against the *co-operation* of man, in the work of *regeneration*, Mr. Fitz's own testimony supports the *affirmative* side of the question. He says, "Man is regenerated in Christ. When a man arrives at the knowledge and belief of this fact, he is '*born from above*.' He is 'delivered from the power of *darkness*, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son.'" Now, it is reasonable to suppose that Mr. F. arrived at this *knowledge and belief*, (which he calls being "*born from above, or regenerated*," by some reading, investigation, meditation, &c. It was thus he *co-operated* with God with respect to his own *regeneration*. 2dly. Admitting, for a moment, that Mr. F.'s doctrine be the *truth*, he is now, weekly, *co-operating* with its Divine Author in the dissemination of this truth, and, consequently, in the *regeneration of others*. 3dly. He is not *compelled* to do this, neither was he *compelled* to seek the truth himself; therefore, he is a *free-agent*.

REMARKS.

Mr. W. in his *second** paragraph considers it "ridiculous to talk of man's *acting* before he *exists*." We are of the same opinion. The thing that is formed cannot assist him that formed it. Now it is quite as ridiculous to suppose that God, who formed man, cannot *make man again*, another vessel, without man's assistance. (See Jer. xviii. 3, 4.) Sir, here is another specimen of our *logic*. We are of opinion that all your turning and twisting will not hide the truth from your readers. Con-

* For convenience, we number the paragraphs, reckoning that which commences the Extract in this Number, as the first.

sider your illustration of spiritual things by natural figures. Take your physician and patient. Let your patient be *dead*, in a *grave*, his flesh withered, his bones separated, and then, Sir, give us a specimen of your *logic*, in showing how he can *co-operate*! This is the figure, and the only one, which can illustrate the subject. If you dispute this, we refer you to the prophet Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14. If you insist upon another figure, take a patient in a case of obstinate *syncope*, or *apoplexy*. Try your *logic* here! You say, "Our business is with man, as a *living* and active being." Sir, your business must be with man, as *dead*, incapable of acting, in spiritual things, only as he is acted upon. Examine the natural figure. A patient, the subject of *syncope*, or *apoplexy*, cannot possibly *co-operate* with the physician. You, Sir, may answer the question—"Does it imply any *imperfection* in his skill or science, to say that he *cannot* perform that cure alone, which he might have effected with the *patient's co-operation*?" You shall have a case in point. The "ruler's daughter," Matt. ix. 25.

Mr. W. in his *third* paragraph asks, "What are these *means* and opportunity afforded for, if *man* can do nothing?" Ans. We have not said that "*means and opportunity*" are afforded man to enable him (man) to raise himself *incorruptible and immortal*. We have said that God does this. That "man is only the recipient of God's *goodness*." By *means* and opportunity, we mean God's *method* of making man the recipient of his goodness in this mode of being. For God "is good to all." We believe that man suffers here, as a consequence of distrusting the goodness of God.

Mr. W.'s remarks on children, &c. will not answer. Mankind in the aggregate are the children or offspring of God. According to Mr. W.'s conclusion, the absurdity is as great, should he "compel his children to act differently from their own choice," as for God to compel his children. Strictly speaking, a man is *compelled* to change his belief, when God enlightens his understanding to behold the truth, and the man is convinced of the falsehood of his former faith. Mr. W. says, "*rationality* is what alone renders the will *free*." Idiots and brutes are consequently not *free-agents*, and man only becomes so, by the gradual expansion and *perfection* of his rational principle, as he advances from infancy to adult age." We reply—By *rationality* we must understand the *power of reasoning*. Mr. W. has settled the question of *free-agency* and defined it to be a *power of reasoning perfectly*. Does man, in the aggregate, infants and idiots excepted, possess this power? If so, Mr. W. is correct. If not, he is in gross error. God says, "The *or knoweth* his owner," &c, "but my people do not *know*." If my people possessed a power of reasoning *perfectly*, they would be *free-agents*, according to Mr. W. But, as my people are below the *brutes* in knowledge, then, it follows, according to Mr. W. that my people are *not free-agents*! Sir, this, also, is *our logic*. Call it ridiculous, if you please; but your readers, we think, would award you more praise, if you were to *prove* it so.

Mr. W.'s *fourth* paragraph is a defence of the poet's "*eternal now*." But, alas! for Mr. W., his efforts to extricate himself from absurdity, only plunge him deeper. He argues, that all *ideas* in the Divine mind, must be without beginning and without end. An *eternal now will always last*. Very well, Sir, your *own* logic proves, that "vultures and owls" were always, in the Divine mind, "vultures and owls," and will always remain so; for "*one eternal now* does always last." We beseech you, Sir, not to go beside yourself in the contemplation of your *own* conclusions, and accuse us of being the authors of the mischief.

In his *fifth* paragraph, Mr. W. directs us to his 1st Number, to learn how *many hells* there are; in p. 8, of which, we read the following—"There are also *three hells*, which are the exact *antipodes* of the heavens; the lowest hell being opposite to the inmost or third heaven; the middle hell to the second heaven; and the uppermost hell, to the first or lowest heaven." For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the *lowest hell*." For great is thy mercy toward me: and thou hast delivered my soul from the *lowest hell*."

We have Mr. W.'s word that there are *three Hells*! Pray, Sir, *how* did you learn this fact? Where did you obtain your information? Are these your "*scripture proofs*," to prove that there are "*three Hells*," posterior to the present mode of being? We see no proof here. This is trifling. Mr. W. also refers us to his first number, p. 5. to "find an answer to our next question respecting *redemption*." Here it is—"1. That Redemption consists (not in a pardon obtained by a *vicarious sacrifice*, but) in our Lord's opposing and subduing the powers of darkness, and thus destroying the undue influence which they had acquired over the minds of the human race; thereby restoring man to a state of *spiritual equilibrium*, or freedom of will, and rendering salvation again *possible* to all. He descended to meet our spiritual enemies on their own ground, where 'he trod them in his anger, and trampled them in his fury.' Thus 'in his love and in his pity he redeemed us.'" We must inform Mr. W. that we consider the Book called the Bible, superior to the authority of Messrs. Swedenborg and Arminius. You may talk of your Redemption, which "consists in [your lord's] restoring man to a state of *spiritual equilibrium*," &c. "and rendering salvation *possible* to all." But we shall look to our Lord, whose Redemption is "*forgiveness of sins*." (Ephes. i. 7.) Who renders salvation *certain* to all. (John vi. 33.)

Mr. W. endeavours to escape from the conclusions resulting from his premises, by something which was probably intended for a witticism. If the reader can relish this, we shall submit, of course.

Mr. W.'s *seventh* paragraph is an emendation of his *premises*! Here is trouble. Alas! First declare that "*Man must* be regenerated in this life." Then play upon words, and prove that *children* are not *men*. Sir, you have greatly the advantage. You may take *women* also, and make them a party to your new privilege. But Mr. W. refers us to his

first Number, to solve difficulties. There we are told, that "all children are received immediately into heaven by the Lord, and, after *instruction*, or *improvement* in understanding and wisdom, participate in all the happiness and perfection of angels." Excellent. Children do not need regeneration. They only want "*instruction—wisdom*," and so forth! They can obtain this in *another* world. So after all your positive assertions, you will regenerate, in your own way, one half of the human race when your *indispensable* "*medium*" no longer exists. Sir, your finesse is admirable.

Mr. W. seeks a solace in his *eighth* paragraph, for the difficulties which surround him, by attempting to persuade us that we are as blind as himself. Let us examine and reply to Mr. W.'s interrogations.

To the First, we say, "all infants" have not "strayed in sin and error," &c. Mr. W.'s *perhaps*, therefore, is useless. Second—"Why does God permit innocent children to suffer in this world?" We answer—To make them *perfect*. Third—"Is the temporal suffering of an infant of one, two, or three months, intended as a correction to produce reformation?" We answer—"Whom God *loveth* he chasteneth." The reason assigned in the Scriptures is the reason we shall assign, that the party, suffering the chastisement, may be "partakers of His *holiness*." Fourth—"Is such suffering rewarding the infant according to its works?" We answer—The infant has not worked. Fifth—"What works has it performed?" We answer—The infant has not worked. Sixth—"Has it done or neglected to do that for which rewards and punishments (say temporal) are promised or threatened?" We answer—The infant has not worked. Seventh—"Let us have no more evasion, but a *definite* answer to these simple questions." Certainly, Sir; by all means. Eighth—"Or an honest confession of inability to give it." No, Sir, by no means. Reader, keep thine eye on the above, for Mr. W. will not admit that we ever answer questions.

Mr. W.'s *ninth* paragraph is what it is. Reader, alas! for friend W. look at it. He says, our "*fourth* paragraph is devoted to an exhortation, in which we recommend to him to confess the truth of our doctrine." Hear his "honest confession." He "had no idea that the *whole* system was so monstrously *absurd* as he finds it to be." Stop, Sir. Let us go back to the said monstrously absurd doctrine, taught in said fourth paragraph. We asked you "to confess, that *all* men, indiscriminately, will be raised immortal," &c. "death be swallowed up in victory," &c. That "God is *Omnipotent*, and man the creature, offspring, and recipient of God's mercies." That "the devil and his works shall be destroyed," and his destruction to be to the very "*root and branch*." This is pronounced to be "*monstrously absurd*." Reader, the reverse of these propositions must then be the consistent truth; and Mr. Woodworth's doctrine. We forbear farther remark. We pity the man who can call "*good evil*, *light darkness*, and *straight crooked*."

Mr. W. was so shocked with our doctrine, that he missed a whole paragraph of our reply!

Mr. W. in his *tenth* paragraph, declares we have evaded his *three* questions, which he has repeatedly asked us to solve. Sir, we have answered them promptly. If you insist to the contrary, bring them forward, we will answer them *again*! The conclusion of this paragraph is admirable. We do not *know* that all men will enjoy felicity hereafter. Now, what think ye, follows? Why, if something happens that God did not *foresee*, it is an evidence of *ignorance*. If God does not *preserve* and save man, it is an evidence of *indifference*. If God *cannot* save man, it is an evidence of *impotence*. Sir, you cannot escape. If these results happen, from the causes assigned, and you say we speak *evil* of God, because we speak the truth, and assign the *true* causes, we shall be pleased to have you explain how we can speak *good* of God, when we speak *falsely* of him?

Mr. W. in his *eleventh* paragraph, acknowledges that we have, at length, answered *one* of his questions. We beg the reader to recollect this. We had almost despaired of obtaining any acknowledgment. And we tell friend W. frankly, that we cannot, with any propriety, press him to answer *our* questions, for a reason too obvious to be mentioned. Mr. W. agrees with us, in one remark, and interrogates—But why answer him? He does not answer your questions. True, reader; this is too much the case. The matter will appear dry and uninteresting, unless something is said in reply. Therefore, let us hear him interrogate—First: "In what *manner* are mankind benefited by the *sufferings* of Christ?" Ans. Christ was made *perfect* through *sufferings*. His perfection will benefit us, because he is the Head of the Church—the Head of every man; and all men shall rise in his perfect image. Second: Whether "those who lived and died previous to the incarnation, are sharers with us in these benefits?" Ans. If Christ is the Head of *every* man, then every man is a member of his body. Every member of the body shares in the benefits received from the head. Third: "Whether their temporal or eternal states were affected at all by the subsequent work of redemption?" Ans. Having taught that God *foresees* all things, has a *purpose* in all he does, and that his "good pleasure which he purposed in himself," is, in the "dispensation of the fulness of times to gather together in one all things in Christ," we must also believe, that all men, from the beginning, were made and intended to be blessed in Christ, agreeably to the promise made to Abraham.

Mr. W. in his Postscript, considers our "testimony to support the *affirmative* side of the question," relative to "what has been said against the *co-operation* of man in the work of regeneration." We really are at a stand, and do not know how to address Mr. W. whether to scold him, or not. Sir, what benefit can result to any cause, from misrepresentation? Why do you persist in using the terms "*regeneration*?" and "*born from above*," as convertible, in a sense to give the reader to understand that we use them, and make us accountable for absurdities.

ty. You say, "Mr. F. calls being 'born from above,' or *regenerated*." Sir, this is not our mode of expression. Strange to tell, Mr. W. will have it, hypothetically, that we "are co-operating in the *regeneration* of others." His conclusion is perfectly natural, he says, "Sdly. He is not compelled to do this, neither was he compelled to seek the truth himself; therefore he is a *free-agent*." A new way this, to arrive at a favourable conclusion. Sir, you shall have something for your trouble. We acknowledge that we are *free-agents* in proportion to the same extent, as we *co-operate* in *regenerating* the world of mankind. The attentive reader will not be at a loss to understand the full amount of our concession. (To be continued when Mr. W.'s reply appears.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

While the religious world are engaged in controversy, it may not be unprofitable for us, to make some inquiry also. One denomination of Christians, advocate the *vicarious* sufferings of Christ; while another denies the same. One degrades the Saviour to a mere man; another gives him a place superior to angels; and a third exalts him to a station, not exceeded by Jehovah himself. Election, and Reprobation, decrees, and free agency, are alternately admitted and denied. Such being the state of Christendom, it is not to be regretted, it is no cause of lamentation, that the investigation of religious tenets is becoming general. But the disposition manifested by those who have long held the sway over the minds of the community, is truly deplorable. The most inveterate malice is vented against those, who have the boldness to inquire, upon what authority their creeds are founded? How hard is the prohibition for a man, who desires to know the truth, to be deprived of the freedom of thought!

The danger of *innovation*, is considered by many, as a sufficient inducement to oppose any system of religion, which essentially differs from the prevailing creeds. Some evils are to be expected from every great change. But, where the good resulting from it, will greatly overbalance the evil; where the cause of truth will be promoted, duty calls every one to the undertaking. Dark was that day, when Luther arose to enlighten the earth. Man had long groaned under the iron hand of religious despotism. "The sun of righteousness," to appearance, had almost ceased to shine, and the last ray of truth had nearly ceased to glimmer, when he began to expose the errors of Popery. And, will any pretend, that in contending against these errors, he was criminal, because he acted in opposition to the *established* church? If not, why may not the same cause demand the same opposition, at the present? Error is *error*, and its nature can never be changed; how numerous, or venerable soever, its abettors. Since the apostacy, many luminaries have arisen, to enlighten the darkened hemisphere; but their light was too feeble, or too transient, to effect a thorough reformation. Laying open many of the enormities of Popery, and stripping it of much of its paltry covering, were no inconsiderable services to Christen-

dom. What heart glows not with gratitude, to those, who risked their lives to free the world from religious tyranny! Yet, the immediate transition, from the abuses which then existed, to the simple truths of the gospel, was too great for the human mind, unassisted by supernatural powers. The experience of ages fully demonstrate, that great changes are generally effected by degrees. This has been the case, not only in religion, but also in science. At different periods, the mind of man has expanded, and developed the arcana of nature; while centuries have intervened, in which not an individual has existed, to erect a monument in the republic of letters.

Such has been the case with Christianity. Since the beginning of the reformation, it has been gradually divested of its superstitious rites, and ceremonies. But, heretofore those who have made attempts at reformation, have retained so much of the "*mark of the beast and his image*," that room is left for the reformation of the *reformed*. Such is the power of prejudice over the human mind, that those very men, who were so zealously engaged against Popery, retained some of its most glaring absurdities. For instance, the *endless* misery of a certain portion of mankind. This is a prominent feature in the doctrine of *orthodoxy*. This orthodoxy, is supposed to be built upon the testimony of the prophets, and apostles. But this is far from being true. "The restitution of *all* things, has been spoken of by all *God's* Holy prophets, since the world began;" and has been confirmed by an apostle. Against such a host of witnesses, orthodoxy contends in vain.

Man is an envious being, prone to derogate from the happiness of his fellow, when he sees him enjoying a happiness superior to his own. Under the guidance of this spirit, he is often too zealous in an unjust cause. Zeal, which is not according to knowledge, infuriates the mind, and stimulates to the commission of the most inhuman cruelties. Man was created with certain unalienable rights; among which, ought to be admitted *liberty of conscience*. This is the most valuable of rights, and should be held sacred. In the exercise of religion, felicity can be obtained, when all other resorts prove abortive. This, exalts the soul into rapture, and, in imagination, translates it from earth to heaven. Any encroachment upon this privilege, should be guarded against with a jealous eye; and he, who contributes to the enslaving of the minds of his fellow creatures, or opposes the abolition of this slavery, may justly be ranked among the most dangerous enemies to human happiness. Too long, have the nations of the earth suffered under the weight of *Ecclesiastical tyranny*; their miseries unpitied, and their wrongs unredressed. The bloody hand of persecution has been reared over the head of devoted innocence, and the torch has lighted the weary pilgrim to the mansions of the dead. That religion, whose principles, if universally obeyed, would convert the world into a paradise like unto the garden of the Lord, has been too long abused by its pretended admirers; and its name used as a covert to

the basest designs. Societies, differing in principle, have been estranged from each other; and, in many instances, the ties of nature have been disregarded. The mother has forgotten her consanguinity; and brother, has devoted brother to destruction. B. H.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*"

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(Continued from p. 250.)

5. Of all questions, this of eternal punishment meets with the strongest opposition from our prejudices. Self-love the most invincible of our passions, benevolence the sweetest of our affections, though in most cases they restrain each other, in this case unite their whole power of warping the judgment.

When we reason of future punishment, we are criminals judging in our own cause. We have broken the law of God, sin yet maintains some place in our hearts and consciences; before us are death, judgment, and eternity. In this state of awful suspense, our self-love produces an irresistible desire to find our judge determined to save us from everlasting punishment. Most of all, they who are bent upon living contrary to the gospel, must feel a supreme longing to be persuaded that they may indulge their own pleasure, and yet find their judge propitious.

On the other hand, we see our dearest friends and relations in as much or more danger than ourselves. The thought of their suffering eternal punishment fills us with horror. And then such multitudes must be involved in the same ruin. The magnitude of the evil is overwhelming. When the imagination is filled, and the soul sickened, with the image of eternal death, preying upon ourselves, our friends, our fellow-creatures, by millions; we exclaim under the resistless impulse of feeling, "God is too good to subject us to such a doom."

My friends, this is not the voice of reason, but of feeling which conquers reason. Fix your mind now upon a company of poor mortals, in a dark, damp, loathsome dungeon; clanking their chains day and night; famishing, freezing, groaning, weeping, despairing. There are your dear parents, brothers, sisters, children, and the partner of your bosom. How heart-rending their cries! How cruel their sufferings! After many a tedious night, the prison-door opens; a band of pitiless tormentors come and drag them forth before a large assembly. See my mother's face haggard with sorrow—my child's limbs worn to the bone by chains and hunger! Oh! horrible! their cruel keepers are stripping off their rags: they seize the knotty whips; can I hear their moans? Can I look upon their torn and bleeding bodies? Can I contemplate their public

disgrace, and the secret anguish of their souls? *What infernal tyrant has done this?*

Ah, my friends, we have only thought of the suffering; we have overlooked the cause. These are traitors and murderers, who had set law and justice at defiance, betrayed their country, and with cold-blooded cruelty, tortured to death the innocent. They are not my kindred: they are strangers, who have spent their lives in robbery, burning, treason, torture and blood. A free pardon was offered them, if they would but repent of their deeds, and reform their lives. They scorned the offered mercy; and determined, as long as they had the power, to betray and murder still. Are you not ready to exclaim, *What partial judge has favoured them with a punishment so light, and so inadequate to their crimes?*

Thus you see how easy it is to feel indignation even at civil punishments, when we keep out of view the crimes of the sufferers, and consider them as our kindred. Now we do not know, as before observed, the evil of sinning against God, refusing his mercy and persevering in wilful impenitency during life. We do not know all the reasons which may determine infinite wisdom to make future punishment eternal, but suitable in degree to the several degrees of guilt. Certainly, however, God is not governed in his judgments by blind feelings of sympathy; which are suitable to our condition, but not to his steady purposes of wisdom. We see children more influenced by feeling to judge wrongly than men. Human judges ought not to give way to them: and we ought surely to distrust our own judgments concerning the incomprehensible subject before us, when we see honest men, through self-love, often contend for what is not their right; just judges not trusted with the trial of their own cause, nor that of their relations: the case of a criminal generally viewed in the most favourable light by himself and his friends. If then revelation teach something concerning future punishment, which we would not have expected, we have abundant reason to give up our own judgments, as being founded on weakness, ignorance, partiality, and prejudice.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. R. decides, that "of all questions, this of eternal punishment meets with the strongest opposition from our prejudices." This we deny. But this Reverend gentleman, to prove his assertion, says, "Self-love the most invincible of our passions, benevolence the sweetest of our affections, though in most cases they restrain each other, in this case unite their whole power of warping the judgment." Pray, are "self love and benevolence" prejudices? If man's benevolence, generally, strongly opposes endless misery, how will the benevolence of Christ oppose it? How will the benevolence of a God of love oppose it, who has declared, although the mother may forget her son, He will never leave nor forsake us? "The sweetest of our affections" oppose eternal punishment. Sir, how do the *sourcest* passions and feelings vote on this question? Surely, if the sweetest oppose, the sourest must advocate the doctrine of eternal punishment. Thus, Sir, you fur-

nish the conclusion, that the *best* feelings of your nature lie dormant, and the *worst* passions of your bosom hold the reins, while you advocate this wicked doctrine. A terrible conclusion, this; but the inevitable product of your own premises. Sir, you are opposing the doctrine of God's *Universal* love and goodness. This question meets with far stronger opposition from your prejudices, than the contrary sentiment, which, consigns millions to woe inexpressible. Indeed, Sir, you are striving, with all your might, and aided by all your prejudices, to support this horrible hypothesis.

Mr. R. continues—"When we reason of future punishment, we are criminals judging in our own cause." Sir, you have said, *We*, the Reverend Mr. Ruffner, and his compeers, are criminals judging in our own cause. And "*We*" are so much under the dominion of our prejudices, that, rather than fail of establishing *our* cruel hypothesis, and proving that there is an *endless* Hell, *we* will prove our own damnation to be certain. Sir, how is it when you reason of future *happiness*? Are not you an interested party? On your own ground, what are your conclusions worth? Surely, Sir, "you are judging in your own cause," view the question as you will. Your argument bristles against you at all points. But, "Most of all, they who are bent upon living contrary to the gospel, must feel a supreme longing," &c. Astonishing! The greatest sinners, the worst of men, "most of all, feel a supreme longing," &c. to 'find their judge propitious.' The humble Christian, according to this conclusion, is indifferent, compared to the vilest wretch, about his future destiny. Mr. R. says, "we see our *dearest friends* and relations in as much or more danger than ourselves. The thought of their suffering eternal punishment fills us with horror. And then such *multitudes* must be involved in the same ruin." True, Sir, "the magnitude of the evil is overwhelming," and every honest and enlightened man, must exclaim, "God is *too good* to subject us to such a doom." Here are premises and conclusions which can never be set aside. But hear this Reverend logician—

"My friends, this is not the voice of *reason*, but of *feeling* which conquers reason." Reason, then, is incompatible with feeling. Sir, was it the voice of *feeling* which conquers reason, which cried, "Father, forgive them, for they *know not* what they do?" Mr. R. then indulges in a strain of lamentable description, and portrays, in gloomy colours, the horrible condition of a "company of poor mortals, in a dark, damp, loathsome dungeon." He adds, "these are your dear parents, brothers," &c. He asks, "What *infernal tyrant* has done this?"

"Ah, my friends," says this great logician, "we have only thought of the *suffering*; we have overlooked the cause. These are traitors, and murderers," &c. "They are not *my kindred*." Stop, Sir, where you are. Go back. Why did not Christ say, "These are traitors and murderers, they are not my kindred?" Why did he say, "Father, forgive them?" Christ declared to the multitude, "One is your Father who is in heaven, and all ye are

brethren." (Matt. xxiii.) Paul declared, "God hath made of *one blood* all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth;" and added, "we are also *his offspring*." If "God has made of *one blood* all nations of men," if God is our Father, and all are his offspring, or children, then all who suffer are our *kindred*! But you say, "A free pardon was offered them," &c. and having concluded "they are not *my kindred*," you ask, "Are you not ready to exclaim, What partial judge has favoured them with a punishment so *light*, so inadequate to their crimes?" We ask you, Are not you ashamed of your miserable *sophistry*? You ought to be. Hear the voice of truth. "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am "*married unto you*." (Jer. iii. 14.)

"Thus you see," continues Mr. R. "how easy it is to feel indignation even at civil punishment, when we keep out of view the crimes of the sufferers and consider them as our kindred." A sad mistake this. All our sympathy, concern, and love, has been lavished, not upon friends and kindred, but upon *enemies* and *strangers*. How consistent! The Bible requires us to sacrifice our feelings of love and sympathy, to *hate* our enemies, and to care nothing about strangers. This is the conclusion. How do you like it, Sir? Reader, we rejoice to say, that these sentiments, so precious in the eyes of this Reverend Gentleman, are as opposed to the doctrine we inculcate, as light is opposed to darkness. Our Bible says, "*Love your enemies*." The exhortation concludes, "Be ye therefore perfect, [How?] even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect." God forgives his enemies, and loves them. To be perfect, as God is perfect, we must forgive and love our enemies. We have a reason for this. God loves them because they are his *offspring*. Because he is the God of their Spirits. We ought to love them, because our Father loves them, for they, with all their ignorance and blindness, are our *brethren*; have the same origin, and are destined to the same peaceful home. "He that loveth dwelleth in God, and God in him."

Mr. R. again reiterates the confession of his *ignorance* of the evil of sinning against God. If you are so extremely ignorant, as your modest confessions prove, pray be careful and not unnecessarily expose yourself. For one so *ignorant*, to pretend to so much knowledge, is certainly presuming very unwarrantably. Do you, Sir, know all, or any of "the reasons which may determine infinite wisdom" to make future holiness and happiness, the property of all his offspring? We agree with you, that "God is not governed in his judgments by *blind feelings* of sympathy; which are suitable to" your "condition, but not to his steady purposes of wisdom." Is sympathy a *blind* feeling? Are all those blind who are governed or moved by it? Are you free from this failing? Are your eyes open to all the excellencies of cruelty, malice, and revenge? How do "the scornors delight in their scornings, and fools hate knowledge!" It is the proud Pharisee, the man who "is wise in his own conceit," who is governed by "*blind feelings*;" and whose "tender mer-

cies are cruelty." How is God governed? We answer—By LOVE. A love "stronger than death," which can never be quenched. Christ, the *image* of God, (the likeness of God,) proved the truth of this declaration. Love, call it blind, if you please, conquered. The malice of enmity, the cruelty of revenge, could not extinguish it. The heavenly flame burned with a glorious radiance, when sin was at its most malignant height; and will continue to burn, until all error is consumed. It will diffuse its influences, until the whole creation is blessed with its *fire*, and its rays be reflected from every heart.

What! another acknowledgment of mental imbecility! Look at it. "We ought surely to distrust our *own* judgments concerning the *incomprehensible* subject before us." Sir, we cannot believe you capable of expressing an opinion entitled to a moment's serious consideration as a matter of faith. We distrust your judgment altogether. We "ought surely" to do this; when even you recommend the measure. Why not shut up the book. The man knows nothing; we have his own confession in evidence. The subject is *incomprehensible*, to him; he does not know the evil of sinning. Alas! Sir, what do you know? Nothing—nothing. We are constrained to say, this Reverend gentleman has estimated his powers correctly. Solomon says, "Knowledge is easy to him that understandeth." God speaks, by his prophet, and says, "I will give you pastors according to mine heart, who shall feed you with *knowledge* and understanding." (Jer. iii. 15.) Is this pastor "according to mine heart," who feeds the people with ignorance and uncertainty? Again: "*My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I also will reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me.*" (Hosea iv. 6.) This priest is ignorant, and God's people are destroyed by him. Knowledge saves men. Again: "For the *priest's lips should keep knowledge*," &c. "But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law," &c. "Therefore have I made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, [there is no misery in God's ways,] but have been *partial in the law*. Have we not *all one Father*? hath not one God created us?" (Mal. ii. 7-10.) Yes. But this priest would deceive the people, and cause them to stumble, saying, "*They are not my kindred.*" Again: "Have the workers of iniquity *no knowledge*? who *eat up my people* as they eat bread: they have not called upon the name of the Lord." (Psa. liii. 4.) The name of the Lord is *Saviour*. You call upon the name of a *destroyer*, and eat up God's people.

Mr. R. says, "The case of a criminal is generally viewed in the most favourable light by himself and friends." True, Sir. But how does an *enemy* view the criminal's case? Is God the criminal's enemy? Pause, before you decide. The command is, "Love your enemies." Shall the sinner love God as an enemy, or as a friend? Will not God view the sinner's case in the "most favourable light?" Dare you answer in the negative?

Mr. R. continues—"If then revelation teach

something concerning future punishment, which we would not have expected, we have abundant reason to give up our own judgment, as being founded on weakness, ignorance, partiality, and prejudice." Then, Sir, your judgment must be opposed to reason, &c. What is reason? The Scriptures assure us, that if we reason with God, our sins, though of the colour of scarlet and crimson, shall be as white as wool or snow. What colour do you make sin? Alas! Sir, we have your acknowledgment that you are ignorant. You are incapable of reasoning; and sin to you appears red with malignity, and of endless duration. "Come, then, and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord." Sir, "your judgment is founded on weakness, ignorance, partiality, and prejudice." The subject, on your confession, is to you *incomprehensible*. Your views are "dark and partial." You, Sir, who stand in so great need of teaching, have the presumption to attempt to teach others. Sir, there is a "beam in your eye."

(To be continued.)

NEWS FROM SCOTLAND.

We have received another epistle from our Br. Worrall, dated Glasgow, Oct. 11, 1823, from which we extract the following:

"We have received an epistle from a small church at *Colerain*, in the north of Ireland; of which we had not before heard. It is certain that liberal views of the Divine economy, and rational ideas of the Creator's purpose and design in Redemption, are extending their mild and genial influence around us. May the Great Head of the Church prepare and send forth labourers into the Gospel harvest, who may be powerfully successful in making inroads into the kingdom of darkness, instrumental in dissipating the gloom of prejudice, and successful in counteracting the efforts of priestcraft.

"I admire the liberality and forbearance so long practised among American Universalists; and shall feel unspeakably rejoiced to know that they continue united in sentiment upon the Rock of Ages, Christ Jesus, and preserve the unity of the spirit in the bonds of heavenly peace. The duration of punishment, we may consider a matter of minor importance. *JEHOVAH* afflicts not willingly, nor unnecessarily, grieves the children of men. Not a stripe will be inflicted more than is required for the *good* of the chastised."

Our Br. Worrall for himself, and on behalf of our brethren in Glasgow, tenders grateful acknowledgments to those who have forwarded books, and "administered to the intellectual pleasure and gratification" of our distant Brethren.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—JOHN XIX. 30.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1824.

NO. 34.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*"

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(Continued from p. 262.)

We shall now consider the duration of future punishment as a doctrine of Revelation. The proposition which I shall endeavour to maintain on this head, is most plainly expressed in the text:

These (namely, the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment.

Let us observe the connexion. Our Saviour was discoursing upon the general judgment of mankind at the end of the world. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all his holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats: and he shall set the sheep [the righteous] on his right hand; but the goats [or wicked] on his left. Then shall the king say to them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also to them on his left hand, Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment."

In this solemn discourse of Christ, the state of the wicked after the last judgment is twice declared: first in the sentence pronounced upon them, Depart into everlasting fire; secondly, in the actual effect of that sentence, They shall go into everlasting punishment. By the word *everlasting* he certainly designed to teach us the duration of their punishment. He evidently laid great stress on that word; for he added it both in the sentence of the wicked and in the predicted execution of the sentence; though in the sentence of the righteous, nothing is said of the duration of their happiness.

How would a teachable inquirer, who had no criticisms to perplex, nor previous notions to bias him, understand our Saviour's doctrine? That future punishment would be *temporary*, and all men finally saved? No, the Saviour said no such thing. That the punishment would be *everlasting* or, what is the same—*endless*? Certainly; for so the Saviour declared repeatedly and emphatically.

But we are told that the translation conveys a

different idea from the original Greek;—that the word [*αιωνιος*] *aionios*, translated *everlasting*, is frequently applied to temporal things;—and *may* signify a temporary duration in this place. I find it necessary therefore to point out the use of this word in the New Testament, and to afford all my hearers some plain and satisfactory means of judging what idea it was intended by our Saviour to convey.

The Greek word [*αιωνιος*] *aionios*, translated *everlasting*, is, I freely admit, sometimes applied to things of a temporal nature. But in that it differs not from the word *everlasting*, which we frequently use in the same way. We speak of the everlasting hills, everlasting disgrace, renown, &c. when we have nothing in view beyond the affairs of this world. The same remark is applicable to the words *eternal*, *for ever*, *immortal*, &c. which convey the same idea of duration. But in those cases we evidently use the words in a figurative sense, to magnify the idea of the long duration of things known to be temporal; and because they are known to be temporal, such a use of the words conveys no wrong notion. We at once make the necessary allowance.

Sometimes those words are employed to signify that the thing spoken of is never to return to its former state. Thus a slave for life is called a slave for ever, because he is never to live in freedom. Sodom and Gomorrah were consumed with eternal fire, because they were never to recover from its effects. In such cases, the idea of eternity is conveyed negatively. But no one imagines from the occasional application of those words to temporal objects, that their proper signification is a temporary and limited duration; or how could we apply them to God and heaven and all endless things? When solemnly teaching doctrines, we never call a temporal object *eternal* or *everlasting*.

In like manner the Greek word. Sometimes, when applied to things of this world, it is to be understood in a limited sense. But it most properly signifies endless duration; as you will readily perceive, when I repeat to you some New Testament phrases in which it is used. "The everlasting God; (1) To God be honour and power everlasting; (2) The eternal glory of God; (3) The everlasting kingdom of God; (4) The eternal spirit; Christ obtained for us eternal Redemption, that the called might receive an eternal inheritance. (5) He became the author of eternal salvation. (6) The saints have a house eternal in the heavens; (7) and,

(1) Rom. xvi. 26. (2) 1 Tim. iv. 8. (3) 1 Pet. v. 10. (4) 2 Pet. i. 2. (5) Heb. ix. 12-15. (6) Heb. v. 9. (7) 2 Cor. v. 1.

to mention but one more, the promised reward of the saints is usually called *eternal* or *everlasting* life.

Such are the objects to which the word *αιωνιος* is applied in the New Testament. If that word do not properly signify an eternal duration, it would not be employed to teach us the duration of all eternal things.

I will quote a text, which determines the proper sense of this word as decisively, as if it had been formed for no other purpose. It is 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

"For our light affliction which is but for a moment, shall work out for us a far more exceeding and *eternal* weight of glory: while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are [*προσκαιρα*] temporal, or for a time; but the things which are not seen are [*αιωνια*] eternal."

Here the apostle twice uses the same word [*αιωνιος*] in express opposition to other words which signify a limited duration. First, he contrasts the affliction of the present life with the glory in the life to come: the one is light, the other has a weight exceeding all excess; the one is but for a moment compared with the eternal duration of the other. Then he draws a general contrast between the visible things of this world and the invisible things of the world to come: the former are for a time, that is, till the day of judgment; the latter are not for a time, but eternal.

It was evidently the apostle's intention to heighten the contrast to the utmost. He uses such a power of expression as hardly any translation can reach; and if there had been in the language a word more strongly and unequivocally expressive of infinite duration, he would have chosen it when he would make the present life and world seem but the twinkling of a moment. But in fact, the New Testament writers seldom employ any other adjective to teach us what is everlasting.*

On this passage I ground an obvious and incontrovertible rule, that whenever this word *αιωνιος* relates to things in the invisible future world, it signifies endless duration; for that is what Paul by the same word ascribes to those things, in opposition to the limited duration of this world's affairs.†

* I say seldom, because, *aidios*† is twice employed; once to signify the eternity of God's power, and again to signify the eternal punishment of the fallen angels. See Rom i. 20. and Jude 6. *Aphthartos*,‡ incorruptible, is twice applied to the Divine nature, once to heaven, once to the human body after the resurrection. Rom. i. 23. 1 Pet. i. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Tim. i. 17. Once also to the everlasting word of God. 1 Pet. i. 23. And once to the saint's crown of glory. 1 Cor. ix. 25. The usual Scripture terms for endless duration are *αιωνιος*,§ and its substantive *aion*.||

† Not that every distinct act and circumstance in our future states must be eternal; but the states themselves, considered as good or bad, together with all the objects connected with them, whose nature admits of permanency. There will doubtless be successive actions and events in heaven; but heaven and the state of the saints in it, are not therefore the less eternal. So of hell.

† *aidios* † *Aphthartos* § *αιωνιος* || *aion*

And it is remarkable that this word is in the New Testament applied to a temporal object but once, and then obviously in a figurative sense. (Philemon 15.) Our text is therefore correctly translated. The Greek word as strictly and appropriately signifies endless duration, as any word in the Greek or English language. It is the usual, standing adjective of the New Testament, to distinguish all eternal, from all temporary things. Eternal therefore must be the punishment of the wicked; unless the nature of the subject, the context, or other texts on the same subject, necessarily restrain us from understanding the word in its proper sense.

Sometimes the nature of the subject teaches us that a word is not to be taken in its usual and proper sense. But it is as possible for God to make punishment eternal as temporary; and how long he has determined to make it, we can ascertain only from the language of his word.

Is there any thing in the passage connected with our text, which should lead us to a different construction? Far from it; both here and every where else, the judgment of the last day is represented as final; the wicked are left in their eternal fire and eternal punishment, without the least intimation of any possible deliverance.

Nay, the context does more than leave the enemies of God to their doom; it fixes them there as long as heaven itself endures. Read the whole verse in which the text is found: "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into *everlasting* life." The same word is used to express the duration of both. Our Divine teacher, solemnly instructing us concerning the future states of men, when the truth depends upon the exact use of language, first declares that the wicked shall be consigned to everlasting fire; then, instead of limiting the expression, he concludes the whole doctrine, by affirming, in the same breath, without distinction or restriction, that the states of the wicked and the righteous are both to be everlasting.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

We object altogether to Mr. Ruffner's assumption of the premises which he so exultingly exhibits. Sir, why talk of the "duration of *future* punishment?" There is no *future* punishment posterior to the present mode of being. If you dissent, prove the contrary, which is your premises, to be truth. To take *things for granted*, and reason as though they were *proved*, is puerile. You say, "the proposition which I shall endeavour to maintain on this head, is most *plainly* expressed in the text." Your "proposition," as stated by yourself, is, that "sinners shall suffer *endlessly* in *hell* after death." (Page 5.) We ask, Is this "proposition most *plainly* expressed in the text?" Read it—

"These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment."

You are bound to reply to the following interrogation—Do the words *kolasin aionion*, (rendered "everlasting punishment," in the text,) "most *plainly* express that sinners shall suffer *endlessly* in *hell* after death?" We call upon you, Sir,

publicly, to answer in the columns of this Paper. You present yourself in, the imposing guise of a professor of languages. Why did you pass by the word *kolasin*, rendered *punishment*, and deceive the reader by insinuations, or by leaving him to the wild uncertainty of conjecture, relative to the nature and end of the punishment? Can it be possible that you are ignorant of the definition of this word? If not, is it honest or honourable, to pass it by; to make a display of your abilities as a professor, by multiplying words to no purpose, and leave the most prominent and interesting part of your text without so much as one syllable in explanation or proof? This, Sir, militates against you. The charge of ignorance or deception lays at your door.

Mr. R. says, "Let us observe the connexion. Our Saviour was discoursing upon the general judgment of mankind at the end of the world." Sir, we admit that the general judgment was spoken of. We, Sir, shall prove, not take for granted, that the general judgment commenced at the end of the Jewish dispensation. Rev. xiv. 6, 7. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell upon the earth, and to every nation and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him: for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." This testimony settles the question. The judgment commenced, or the hour of God's judgment came, when the Gospel was preached. The preaching of the Gospel, and the hour of God's judgment were simultaneous. This Sir, was at the "end of the world." "You are correct in this. But the grand question is, *When* did the world spoken of end? Of necessity, when the Gospel was preached, instead of the law. We give you Paul's testimony—Heb. ix. 26. "But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." In the connexion, Matt. xxiv. 3. Christ's disciples ask him, "Tell us, *when* shall these things be? and what the sign of *thy coming*, and of the *end* of the world?" Christ answers, and declares, at the 34th verse, "Verily, I say unto you, *This generation* shall not pass, till *all these things be fulfilled*." And of the same event, he declares, Matt. xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Also, in Matt. x. 23, in his address to his disciples, as follows—"When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." In Mark xiii. Christ's disciples interrogate him, and receive for answer, "Verily, I say unto you, That *this generation* shall not pass, till *all these things be fulfilled*." In Luke xxi. The same is declared, as follows—"For these be the days of vengeance; that all

things which are written may be fulfilled. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." Christ declares, Matt. xxiv. 21, "For there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, *no, nor ever shall be*." How does this agree with your *future* punishment? This is a quotation which Christ made from Daniel xii. 1. Sir, here is evidence, proof, the declaration of our Saviour, that he would come during the lifetime of the generation to whom he addressed himself. We have proved by Christ's testimony, that the judgment which you make *future*, is past. Beware how you deny the testimony of Christ.

Now, Sir, for the punishment. We appeal to you, as a professor of languages, for the truth of our declaration, that the word *kolasin*, rendered punishment, cannot be honestly defined without taking into the definition the figure of the husbandman *pruning trees*. The nation of the Jews are separated. They have gone into the everlasting punishment; they are "chosen in the furnace of affliction. Jerusalem has received at the Lord's hand *double for all her sins*. Her warfare is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned." (See Isa. xl. 2.) You must bow to these testimonies. You well know, that, according to your hypothesis, the *elect* are not punished. A *vicarious* sacrifice saves them from punishment. Here is *non-elect* Jerusalem punished. Rewarded *double for all her sins*. (Not some of them.) Her warfare is accomplished! *Endless misery*, Sir, when will that warfare be accomplished? Her iniquities are pardoned. Are iniquities pardoned when they are punished interminably? Sir, you must choose. Tell us, we beseech you, who is this Jerusalem who "receives at the Lord's hand *double for all her sins*?" Is it the elect, or non-elect? What becomes of your doctrine of *future* punishment? If Jerusalem can receive *double* for all her sins, in this mode of being, and the tribulation is greater than ever before happened to any people, or shall ever happen again, does it not follow, that the "wrath has come upon them to the uttermost?" Does it not follow, that your doctrine is false? Sir, you *must* confess, that the warfare of Jerusalem was accomplished, and her iniquities pardoned, after the *last judgment*, after Jerusalem departed into *everlasting fire*. Also, that Jerusalem received, in the everlasting fire, "*double for all her sins*." Jerusalem had her *part* in the lake of fire. Sir, is it not absurd, to talk of having a *part* in a lake of fire, if the party is to have their *whole* future existence in it?

What is the fire which is prepared for the devil, &c? (Isa. ix. 18, 19.) "For *wickedness* burneth as a fire," &c. "The people shall be as the *fuel* of fire." (James iii. 6.) "And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature: and it is set on fire of hell." Is the tongue set on fire of *hell*? Does *wickedness*

burn as a fire? Then wickedness is hell. The tongue is set on fire of wickedness. Jerusalem received double for all her wickedness. When her wickedness is destroyed, hell is destroyed—the fire burns Jerusalem no more—the everlasting punishment ceases! The prophet Ezekiel says, (xvi. please to read from 40th to 63d verses) of Jerusalem, that they were more abominable than Sodom! Christ declares, of the judgment of Sodom, that it should be [esteemed] more tolerable than the judgment of the Jews. Jeremiah, in his Lamentations, says (iv. 6.) “For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater* than the punishment of Sodom, *that* was overthrown as in a *moment*, and no hands stayed on her.” The fire which destroyed Sodom burned for ages, but Sodom suffered only for a *moment*! Thus, Sir, we have proved the Jews to be the greatest sinners; even more abominable than Sodom, and God declares of them, “So will I make my fury towards them to rest, I will be quiet, and will be *no more angry*.” (Ezek. xvi. 42.) Christ concludes his lamentation over Jerusalem, saying, “Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.”

Although Mr. R.’s hypothesis is destroyed by the testimony we have adduced, we shall proceed and examine his premises and conclusions.

Mr. R. says, “By the word *everlasting* he certainly designed to teach us the *duration* of their punishment.” Mr. R. then considers, that a “teachable inquirer” would understand the Saviour to mean and say, “That the punishment would be *everlasting*, or, what is the same—*endless*.” He adds, “for so the Saviour declared repeatedly and emphatically.” (Mr. R. gives only his word for this.) We ask, Sir, can it be possible that Christ contradicted the testimony of “all God’s holy prophets?” They testified of “the *restitution of all things*.” (Acts iii. 21.) Even of Jerusalem, more abominable than Sodom. Certainly, Christ could not contradict all God’s prophets, and he must have done this, if he declared the punishment of Jerusalem to be *endless*; for the prophets all testify of the restoration of Jerusalem. Sir, what did Christ design to teach by the word *aionion*, rendered *everlasting*? The *duration* of their punishment, think ye? How does Christ use the same word in John xvii. 3. “*This is life aionion*,” (everlasting, this, what?) “that they might *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” Does Christ mean that *knowledge* is endless in *duration*, or that *knowledge* is *life*? Does Christ by the word *aionion*, in this passage, design to teach us the *duration* of the life, or the *nature* of the life? We read, “In his [God’s] *favour* is life.” They that know God, know that he is favourable, that he is a God that pardoneth iniquity; therefore, this knowledge is to them life. Is it incorruptibility and immortality? No! It is the *life of the age*. In another world, when man shall have risen in the heavenly image, incorruptible and immortal, this knowledge, which is in part, will be done away; for then, that which is *perfect* will come; immortality, &c. (See

1 Cor. xiii. 8–13.) Man will then *see*—now he believes—now he hopes; then he will possess. The word *aionion* relates to that which can be measured. Its substantive is perfectly synonymous with the English word *age*. Make a new word, and derive it from the word *age*—say, *agion*. We fearlessly answer—It will mean precisely as the Greek word *aionion*. But why make a new word? We answer, There is no word in the English language which answers to the Greek word *aionion*. We have a word synonymous with the substantive *aion*, why not have an adjective synonymous with the Greek adjective *aionion*? The English language is imperfect without it. With it, it is more perfect. What does *agion* life mean? Ans. The life peculiar to the age spoken of. What does *agion* punishment mean? Ans. The punishment peculiar to the age spoken of. That is, the life and the punishment of the age spoken of. The life of the age, is the life which proceeds from a knowledge of God, &c. The death of the age proceeds from ignorance of God. The age spoken of, is one peculiar and different from others, as regards the punishment. For the punishment of Jerusalem was such “as was not from the beginning of the world to that time, no, nor ever shall be.” Consequently, the punishment of any other age, although the word *aionion*, or *agion*, may denote the quality or nature of the punishment, the *age* must be considered as defining the quality or nature of the punishment altogether. Now the *agion* life will always depend upon knowledge. If the knowledge is the same to believers in every age, the *agion*, or *aionion* life will be the same. But, the *aionion* punishment cannot always be the same in every age. Jerusalem suffered a punishment *greater* than any other people. Consequently, all posterior punishment, although it must be called *agion* or *aionion* punishment, (if there is such punishment,) must be less afflictive in its nature.

Christ, therefore, has defined the word *aionion*, by the use he has made of it; showing that it is properly applied to designate the *nature* of a thing, and not the *duration* of the thing. Mr. R., to avoid the difficulty arising from the objection that the word *aionion* “is frequently applied to temporal things, finds it necessary to point out the use of this word *aionios*, in the New Testament.” He considers the word applicable to the fire that destroyed Sodom, &c. because Sodom will never recover from its effects. The prophet Ezekiel, xvi. informs us that Sodom will recover.

Mr. R. introduces several passages where the adjective occurs, to prove that the word “*properly* signifies *endless* duration.” Admit this, and it follows that the word is *improperly* used when it is applied to designate a *limited* duration. We ask, Does the word *aionion*, when applied to God, signify a duration as endless as God’s existence, without beginning and without end? If you answer in the affirmative, you must then admit, that this word, thus applied, signifies a duration different from any duration when it is applied to man, the *punishment* of man, or any thing relative to man; because man and his punishment had a beginning. Now, Sir, is

it the "proper signification of the word," abstractly considered, or is it the application of it, which defines its meaning? You must reply, It is the application of the word. If God's existence is endless, this word will not shorten it. If the punishment of sinners is limited, this word will not extend the duration of the punishment. But, if the word properly signifies an endless duration, without any reference to its application, then it can never be used correctly, unless it is applied to the Deity. Sir, you must admit this conclusion. Therefore, according to your hypothesis, the Scriptures deal in *hyperbole* beyond even the writings of Munchausen. Sir, we read not of a single eternity, or endless duration coming to an end, but of eternities ending!!! More than this—we read of durations extending to a number of eternities!!! We fearlessly assert, that, according to Mr. R.'s hypothesis, no book can be found so crowded with extravagant absurdities and falsehood, as the Bible. You, Sir, make Paul say, (Col. i. 26,) "The mystery which hath been hid from *eternities*, [through endless durations] and from generations, but is now made manifest to his saints."

Mr. R. says, "I will quote a text, which determines the proper sense of this word as decisively, as if it had been formed for no other purpose. It is 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18." Sir, we must be permitted to read this passage correctly. Thus—"For our present light affliction worketh for us an excessively exceeding *aionion* weight of glory," &c. Sir, say *eternal*, and explain to us, how *eternity* can be "*excessively exceeded*?" Mr. R.'s exertions, therefore, have wholly failed. Mr. R. with much apparent candour instructs the reader relative to other words used by the New Testament writers. His note in the margin is to qualify his exception. Sir, we must speak too. Paul says, Heb. vii. 16, of Christ, that he is "made after the power of an *endless life*." Or, *zoes akatalutou*.

Mr. R., alluding to his quotation, says, "On this passage I ground an obvious and incontrovertible rule, that when this word *aionios* relates to things in the invisible future world, it signifies endless duration," &c. Sir, you do this, not because the word *aionios* properly signifies an endless duration, but because you believe the things in the invisible future world are endless in duration." Here, Sir, is a complete renunciation of your former ground! Sir, please to remember, you must first prove that sinners are punished in "the invisible future world," before even your qualified definition of the Greek adjective can benefit your hypothesis. Alas! for the man, what can he do now! Sir, we have proved that the punishment is in the present visible world. We have now even your admission, that the word *aionios* must refer to the things of the *future* invisible world, to signify *endless* duration.

Reader, the battle is over. Our opponent is dead from a wound received from his *own* weapon. Peace to his manes! But, a word to his memory.

Mr. R. decided that God's word only can inform us how long he has determined to make punishment. True, Sir; and we read, "God will not

contend for ever." Again: "Who is a God like unto thee, that *pardoneth* iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger for ever, [Why?] *because he delighteth in mercy*. He will turn again, he *will have compassion* upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." (Micah vii. 18, 19.)

Mr. R. asks, "Is there any thing in the passage connected with our text, which should lead us to a different construction?" Sir, read the *whole* Bible, it is all connected with your text. Pray, are "the wicked left in the eternal fire," in the quotation from Micah? Mr. R. continues—"The context does more than leave the enemies of God to their doom, it fixes them there as long as heaven itself endures." Sir, God speaks—"I *will not* contend for ever, neither will I be always wrath: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls I have made. For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wrath, and smote him; I hid me, and was wrath, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart. I have seen his ways, and *will heal him; I will lead him also*, and restore comforts unto him and to his mourners." (Isa. lvii. 16—18.)

(To be continued.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

DEMONOLOGY.

What is the Devil?

This question may be decided by a right understanding of those Scriptures which speak of this evil being; who is called in Greek *diabolos*, *calumniator*, or *accuser*, Rev. xii. 9. and 10. When the woman, or true church fled into the wilderness, war was said to be in heaven; so that Michael and his angels fought against the dragon and his angels: the great dragon was cast out into the earth that old serpent, called the *Devil*, or calumniator, *accuser*, and Satan, or adversary, that deceiveth the whole world; and his angels were cast out with him. Then John heard a loud voice, saying in heaven, "Now is salvation come, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ. For the *accuser* of our brethren is cast down, which *accused* them before our God day and night." But woe to the inhabitants of the earth, for the Devil is come down to you. And when the dragon, or Devil, the accuser saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman, or true church, that brought forth the man-child: and she fled into the wilderness, from the face of the *serpent*, not dragon, which cast out of his mouth water, i. e. doctrines, as a flood, &c. to destroy the true church.

Here it appears that the Devil is the dragon. What does dragon mean in the scripture? It means a tyrant, or tyrannical government. Psa. lxxiv. 3. For thus saith Ezekiel, (xxix. 3.) "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I am against thee, Pharaoh, king of Egypt, the *great dragon*," &c. The great dragon that was cast out of heaven into the earth, was the Pagan or Roman empire, or Pagan power, that was cut down by Constantine. Cast out of heaven, i. e. cast out of dominion; into the earth,

i. e. unto the ground. Hence it appears the dragon, or Devil, may be in heaven, or among the ruling powers of government, or in the earth, i. e. among the common people. What is then the Devil?

He is called the *Old Serpent* in Rev. xii. 9. He is styled the *piercing serpent*, or *Leviathan*, in Isaiah xxvii. 1. For thus wrote that prophet, "The Lord cometh to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity. In that day, the Lord with his force, and great, and strong sword, shall punish Leviathan, the piercing serpent, even Leviathan, that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon, (or Devil) that is in the sea." Serpent signifies something *searching*; subtle. The serpent of Christendom, so called, Rev. xx. 2. appears to have had seven heads and ten horns; or seven kinds of governments, and ten kingdoms to support them. Hence the Roman empire was a persecuting and fierce dragon, while pagan; and a persecuting and hidden *serpent* and *Beast* ever since: for it had seven heads or forms of government, and was once the head of ten kingdoms in Europe. It was not the *dragon*, (pagan Rome,) but the *serpent*, (christian Rome, falsely so called) that endeavoured to destroy the true church in the wilderness, by *floods of false doctrines*, and sects. The dragon was an open adversary or Satan; but the serpent is a secret and hypocritical adversary. Each was the Devil, antichrist. What then is the Devil? He is put for *idols* in 2 Chron. xi. 15. and *Psa. cvi. 37.* He is put for *wicked man* in John vi. 70. where Judas is called a devil. Peter too became a *Satan*, when he opposed Jesus Christ, Matt. xvi. 23. Satan is said to have *entered Judas*, Luke xxii. 3. which entrance intimates that Satan was not in Judas before such entrance. He desired also to have Peter, then not a Satan, to sift him as wheat. He conversed with God, according to the book of Job, ch. i. and ch. ii. And Job was delivered, so far, into his power, that he who is called the *prince and power of the air* in Eph. ii. 2. the *spirit* that worketh in the children of disobedience had power, (*as such a spirit*), to afflict Job. So that this power of the air slew sons and daughters of Job by a wind from the wilderness; caused his property to be taken off by the Chaldeans and Sabeans, and his servants to be slain;—his cattle and servants to be consumed by fire, or lightning from heaven; and finally he smote Job with boils or small-pox, and abused Job through his misjudging friends.

What then is Satan? He is called the *wicked one*, Matt. xiii. 19. and 38. 1 John ii. 13. and 14. iii. 12. v. 18. "The *tares* are the children of the *wicked one*. But saints have overcome this Belial or *wicked one*. Cain was of that *wicked one*. But he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and that *wicked one* toucheth him not." He is called an *unclean spirit* in Zach. when the Lord said, "I will cut off the name, of the idols; and will cause the prophets, and the *unclean spirit* to pass out of the land." The Devil is called the *unclean spirit* in Luke viii. 29. and ix. 42. Jesus said, Bring thy son hither. And as he was yet coming, the *Devil* threw him down and tare him. And Jesus rebuked

the *unclean spirit*, and healed the child. An *unclean spirit* is frequently mentioned in Mark. The missionary, Lewis Way, writes from Palestine, 1822, that "It is remarkable, the phenomena of *demoniacal* possessions and influence are as much the subject of observation in these parts *now*, as at the first advent."

To be possessed with *devils*, means to be possessed with *demons*: *devils* being the translation of the Greek *daimonos*, *demons*: as in Matt. iv. 24. viii. 16, &c. Demons are the spirits of deceased people; some of which being good, were termed by the Greeks *eudemons*; but others being bad, or devils, they were named *cacodemons*. Devils (i. e. demons) besought Jesus to let them, (when they should come out of two persons whom they possessed,) enter into a herd of swine. And Jesus said, Matt. viii. 32. Go. And the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished, *there*. Some of the Jews accused Jesus of casting out *demons* through the *prince of chief of demons*, which prince was called Beelzebub, Luke xi. 15. Matt. xii. 24. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 20. declared that the Gentiles, or Greeks, sacrificed to *demons*, devils or departed spirits. This they did in sacrificing to *dead heroes*, dead *benefactors*; and others as to Hercules, Esculapius, Ceres, Bacchus, Venus, Diana, &c. Worshipping some of them as saints.

If demons are *devils*, and *Baalzebub* is their prince, what is the *Devil*, but some *evil spirit*, or the *prince* of them? That devil, (demon) is an *evil spirit* in man, men, nations, or false churches, is inferable, Luke viii. 2. And certain women which had been healed of *evil spirits* and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven *demons*, &c. King Saul was troubled at times with an *evil spirit*, that attempted to slay David, the Lord's anointed. In Acts xix. 12. to 16. is an account of exorcists undertaking to cure demoniacs in the name of the Lord Jesus; but the evil spirit answered these exorcists or seven sons of Sceva, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?"

Who is the God of this world, that blinds the minds of those who believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them? 2 Cor. iv. 4. who is the Prince of this world? John xii. 31, who is the power of darkness, Luke, xxii. 53. Col. i. 13. The devil, who is the power of death, (Heb. ii. 14.) is not merely a Judas, a Peter, a calumniator, an accuser of the brethren, a deceiver, Rev. xx. 10; a liar, Rev. xiii. 2. John. viii. 44. A murderer, do. A tormentor, Matt. xvii. 34. A persecutor, Rev. ii. 10. An unclean spirit, Zach. xiii. 2. An evil spirit, i. Sam. xvi. 14, &c. Luke, vii. and viii. Acts, xix. 12. Nor Rome pagan, nor the dragon, nor Rome christian, so called, or the serpent, the old serpent, the devil; nor in other words is he civil, nor is he merely ecclesiastical tyranny? But from what I have quoted from the scriptures of truth he appears to be all these things. He is styled a *one*, a *wicked one*, the wicked one; the *evil spirit*, that is the *power of darkness*, Eph. ii. 2. Luke, xxii. 53. Col. i. 13. That is the *power of death*,

Heb. ii. 14. He is the God of this world, 2 Cor. iv. 4. The man of sin mentioned, 2 Thes. ii. iii. &c. who, satan like, (as he is satan,) *opposeth* and exalteth himself above all that is called God, setting in the temple of God as God, showing himself that he is God; is God of this world, God of the kingdoms and nations of this globe; though in reality "*the son of perdition; whose coming is after the working of satan*" himself. This satan has his church, his Babylonish church, his antichristian church, which John called the synagogue of satan. John calls him the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is *Abaddon*, but in the Greek tongue hath his name *Apollyon*, i. e. *destroyer*, Rev. ix. 11. For he is chief of the destroying army there mentioned. War, and destruction are of him.

From these and other portions of the Scriptures of truth, I think we may be warranted to conclude, that, the *devil* or *satan* is a *spirit*, that rules among demons or devils, among wicked men, and in antichristian nations, and churches professing Christ in words, but denying him in spirit and works, &c. For he is the serpent, the old serpent, antichrist and deceiver that deceived our first parents, Adam and Eve, by his lies. By a trope or figure of speech, (called metonymy, which name for name imposes; for cause puts the effect, and puts an adjunct for its subject) the effect, adjunct, or container of the devil is spoken of, as if it was the devil himself. Thus a cup is put for the liquor in it, when we say, drink this cup or glass, when we mean the tea or liquor. So that, whatever it be, that has the Devil's spirit, is often called the Devil. This explains why Peter was called Satan, and why an antichristian church was called the old *Serpent* and Devil; and an unjust emperor of Rome and Egypt was called a *Dragon* and devil, though the Devil is a spirit, and invisible to mortal eyes, a God sitting in the temple of God, as a God.

Edmund Burroughs says, "Antichrist is not as some suppose a particular visible person upon earth, but rather an invisible spirit, dwelling in many persons throughout the world. 1 John, ii. 2, says, "There are many antichrists," many men of sin, who are sons of perdition, who have erred from the spirit and power of Christ; professing God in words, but in works denying him. Antichrist is indeed and in truth the very *Devil*; is of him, and yet not divided nor distinct from him. This is not said of the many antichrists, which are only *vessels* retaining this one spirit; and are members of him, through his power dwelling in them. These may be converted and saved, but as for antichrist, as that one particular spirit, he is sealed up in the anger of God, never to be redeemed."

"The kingdom of antichrist, the *Serpent*, the *Devil*, is the power of spiritual wickedness, exercised in the heads of ungodly men: and the mystery of iniquity in the hearts of evil men. "His dwelling and working" is in them that perish, in the ungodly, in hypocrites, in all idolaters, in all false worshippers. For antichrist doth dwell and walk in all that are the subjects of his kingdom."

Edward Burroughs further testifies, "There is a Devil which is out of the truth; who abode not in the truth. He is the author of all unrighteousness, and of whatsoever is contrary to God in thought, word or action. He rules king in all the children of the first Adam, who are in evil. He abode not in the truth, and he hath led all mankind out of the truth. He hath power in the earthly part of man, and possesses him, who is not born of the seed of God.

Thus we may perceive that as there are many antichrists, and devils; as well as different heavens, and graves or hells, different deaths, various baptisms, many faiths, many lords, &c. And I have no doubt that *some* of these many faiths, lords and devils, and different hells, and deaths shall be *destroyed*, as the Scriptures declare. Thus in Rev. cx. 13, which apocalypse writes of things in this life and world, that death and hell, or the grave, delivered up the dead which were in them. And that death and the grave, or hell, were cast into the lake of fire: "This is the second death." Demons, or spirits of wicked men deceased, seem to have attended some men of Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, Rome, &c. in ancient times, and in modern times also.—Hence the term of necromancers, or such as consulted with the dead, or with familiar spirits. The magicians and sorcerers of Egypt, were able in some way to cast down their rods, as Aaron did; and behold, their rods were serpents; but Aaron's serpent swallowed up theirs. Aaron smote the rivers, and they became blood; and the magicians did so too. Aaron stretched out his hand over the waters and frogs came up; and so did the magicians. But what Aaron did by the finger or power of God, the latter did by enchantments, say Ex. vii. 22.—viii. 7 and 8. King Saul and Manassah distrusted God, but trusted in evil powers, and used *enchantments*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. Balaam used *enchantments*, Num. xxiv. 1. And was called a *soothsayer*, or *diviner*, Josh. xiii. 22. But he was forced to declare, Numb. xxiii. 23, that there was no *enchantment* against Jacob, nor *divination* against Israel. The Greeks divined by a *great serpent*, called Python. Hence a woman possessed with an evil spirit of soothsaying was called Pythonissa, and a man Pythonicus, and Python. In Acts 8, we read of Simon, a sorcerer, whom the people called the great power of God; for he bewitched them, giving out that himself was some *great one*. Some of the Germans are famed at this day for witchcraft, sorcery, and other species of divination. In Acts of the Apostles, chap. xvi. 16, "a Pythonissa, a certain damsel possessed with a *spirit of divination*, [or with a *spirit of Python*] is said to have brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. The same followed Paul and us, saying, 'These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show unto us the way of salvation, and this she did many days. But Paul being grieved turned and said to the *spirit*: 'I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.' And he came out the same hour. When her masters saw the hope of their gains were gone," they got the Roman magis-

trate to scourge and imprison them, for teaching Romans unlawful customs, &c.)

ANTI-PYTHONICUS.

WHAT CHRISTIAN?

A friend recently informed us, that some person had observed, that our remarks on particular occasions did not savour of the spirit of a christian. We ask, What christian? The christian who worships a god whose irrevocable decree consigns three-fourths of the human race to endless wretchedness? If this is intended we plead guilty to the charge. Or the christian who worships a god whose indifference permits the interminable misery of millions of the human family? Then we plead guilty. But of the spirit of those who worship the "God who is the Saviour of *all* men," if our remarks are said not to savour of this spirit, there is room for argument. The misfortune is, our religious opponents are so associated with their doctrines and opinions, in the mind of the *reader*, that we are made accountable for *his* conjectures. Now the truth is, we ardently desire the well-being of every creature. We have no *enemies*. If there are those who cherish enmity toward us, we pity them. We believe and rejoice that all our misguided friends will be saved with a great salvation. We are trying to persuade them of this glorious truth, so interesting to all to know. But, alas! if we portray their "good for nothing" opinions in their true colours, and offer them solid truth in exchange, some of them become ill-natured. We cannot prevent this. We will try to be plain and pleasant, and hope our friends will do the same.

ORTHODOX ERRORS.

A writer in the (Providence) RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER, of Dec. 12th, attempting to establish some favourite principle, introduces a quotation from Paul's epistle to the Galatians, third chapter. In the quotation the supply by the translators, which is in *Italics*, is printed in Roman, and incorporated with the text; making Paul preach a false doctrine, which he never inculcated. It is the 24th verse, "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." Does the *law* bring men to Christ? Christ taught a different doctrine. According to him, the Father, who sent him, draws men; and they can come no other way. Omit the supply, and read, "Wherefore the law was [in the past tense] our schoolmaster unto Christ." Christ is the Master and Teacher of the believer. Paul says, "Before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up," &c. Most assuredly, the words *kept*, and *shut up*, do not mean to bring us!

It is lamentable that teachers should not first learn themselves. Can any benefit result to the cause of truth, from this method of proceeding? The translators, it appears, favoured the sentiment inculcated by the corrupt reading of the passage. Their consciences, however, would not let them deceive the reader to the degree they must, if they added their supply as a *translation* of the original. They, therefore, marked it, by printing it in *Italics*; but

now, modern religionists are bold enough to print it in the text, and make Paul preach an inconsistent and false doctrine.

Presuming the Editor of the *Intelligencer* prefers truth, in a plain dress, to error, in all its splendour, we request him to notice the above correction of the error.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

New-York, Dec. 5, 1823.

Br. Fitz—Shortly after the conflagration of the Richmond theatre, the enclosed lines appeared in one of the public papers of this city. I was induced to copy them, from a conviction of the truth of the sentiment therein contained. As it respects the beauty of the poetry, I am not a proper judge. If you should think them worth preserving, you will, by giving them a place in the *Herald*, confer a favour on,

Yours, &c. G. B. T.

The following lines will remind the reader of a Sermon preached lately in one of the churches of this city.

LINES,

On the folly of ascribing to Divine Vengeance, the accidents which result from human indiscretion.

In pious mood Sir Bigot cries,
"Behold! a judgment from the skies!
See Richmond in despair!
No grief like this had rent her heart,
Secure from every hostile dart,
Had virtue flourish'd there.

"Those flames in anger sent to burn,
With ashes fill the mighty urn,
And—though I quake to tell—
This vestibule to scenes below,
Now laid in dust and ashes low,
Has fill'd the vaults of hell!"

Thinkest thou miserable elf,
That God, vindictive as thyself,
Begins a Hell on earth?
Avant! avant! no more blaspheme,
No longer urge the impious theme,
Stamp with Satanic birth.

Mourn (if thou canst) the cruel doom!
That buried in one common tomb,
Worth, virtue, age, and youth.
Mourn, with Virginia, many a Son,
In valour, honour, ne'er outdone;
Daughters of matchless truth!

Mourn, if thou canst; but ah! forbear
To charge on Heaven the fatal snare,
For Heaven delights to save!
Bright the Redeemer's form appears,
Bids mourners smile amidst their tears,
And Hope! beyond the grave!!

CHARITY.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—JOHN XIX. 30.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o'clock.

NOTICE.

The Stockholders of the Gospel Herald Establishment are requested to attend a Meeting of Special Importance, relative to the Establishment, on Monday Evening, January 5, 1824, at 7 o'clock, at the Office, No. 67 Chrystie-street.

Your punctual attendance is requested.

By order of the Committee,

J. BRUSH, Sect'y.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1824.

NO. 35.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"These shall go away into everlasting punishment."

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(Continued from p. 266.)

In like manner the prophet Daniel, speaking of the resurrection, says that they who have done good shall awake to *everlasting* life, and they who have done evil to *everlasting* contempt. (Dan. xii. 2.) Both in the original Hebrew and the Greek of the Septuagint, the same word is used to express the duration of the life of the righteous, and of the disgrace of the wicked. The apostles often quote from the Old Testament according to the Greek of the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew, and the word in the Septuagint is the same as that in our text.

To shew, (if it be not superfluous) the force of this mode of speaking: suppose our Saviour in teaching the doctrine of a future state, had first said the wicked should be sentenced to a temporary fire; and then had concluded by affirming that these should go away into *temporary* punishment, but the righteous to *temporary* life. Would you have understood from this language, that the one was *temporary* and the other *eternal*? Or suppose he had said, that the wicked should go into punishment for an *uncertain* space of time, but the righteous into life for an *uncertain* space of time. Would he have conveyed to you the idea, that the life was certainly eternal, but that the punishment was certainly to end? No, you would spurn such absurd interpretations. But can it lessen the absurdity, that the word is *everlasting*, instead of *temporary* or *indefinite*? Common sense teaches us that when the same thing is affirmed at once of the duration of future life and future punishment, it is denied that they differ in duration, whether it be temporary, uncertain, or everlasting.

But still if other texts upon the same subject declared a difference between the duration of future rewards and punishments, we should have to reconcile them as well as we could. But the inspired language is uniform; always without exception, expressing the continuance of punishment, heaven, God, and all endless things, in the same or similar terms.

Paul says that the wicked at the day of judgment shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his pow-

er.* Here is still the same word in Greek. Our Saviour says in Matthew, "It is better for thee to enter into life halt and maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire." (Matt. xviii. 8.) In Mark we have the same sentiment but a different word. "It is better for thee to go into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*; where their worm dieth not and their fire is *not quenched*." (Mark ix. 43, 44.) The fire which in Matthew is [*αἰώνιος*] everlasting, is a fire that *never shall be quenched*: and still deepening the impression, our Saviour adds, that *there* the wicked are the prey of a *never-dying* worm, and of fire *not quenched*. Here then is an inspired definition of everlasting punishment. Does it restrain the word everlasting to a limited sense, or not? In other places that fire is called *unquenchable* fire.† If its guilty victims should ever rise to heaven, or sink into utter annihilation, how should it be *everlasting*, *unquenched*, *unquenchable*, *never-to-be-quenched* fire, with a worm that *dies not*? If the fuel of the fire, and the food of the worm, be ever consumed, the fire is extinguished, and the worm dies.‡

As [*αἰώνιος*] *aiōnios* signifies eternal, so [*αἰών*] *aion* its substantive, signifies ever or eternity, in its

* 2 Thess. i. 9. † Mark iii. 12. Luke iii. 17.

‡ The word Gehenna, translated hell, is derived from a Hebrew phrase signifying the valley of Hinnom: which was a vale by Jerusalem, where the apostate Jews made their children pass through fire to the idol Moloch. The place was therefore defiled by king Josiah, and made a depository for the filth and carcases of the city. Worms bred in the carcases, and fires were kept up to consume them. All these circumstances made it a place so horrid to the imagination, that it came to be an emblem of hell; and the name of it was afterwards frequently applied to the place of future punishment. The same valley was also called Tophet. 2 Kings xxiii. 10. Jer. vii. 31, 32, and chap. xix. Hence some have supposed that the fire of hell is called everlasting, and unquenchable, in allusion to the constant fires in Tophet. But it is much more reasonable to think that hell fire is called *everlasting* to distinguish it from that in Tophet, which should be quenched, and the worm *never-dying*, to distinguish it from the worms that do die. But we are referred to Isaiah lxvi. 22, for the same expressions that are used by our Saviour, but there applied to dead carcases. That text rather confirms the remarks just made. The prophet was describing the last judgment and the ruin of the wicked, under the figure of a great slaughter in the sight of God's people. Therefore he says, their fire, contrary to other fires, shall not be quenched, and their worm, contrary to other worms, shall not die.

original proper sense.* But sometimes it signifies an age, dispensation, or state of being. How then can we know its exact meaning in a particular place? By this plain rule; when it relates to things belonging only to this visible world, it necessarily bears a limited sense: when to things beyond this world, it signifies an absolute eternity; according to the apostolic rule, things seen are temporal, things not seen, (namely, those of a future state) are eternal. To give a clearer idea of the matter, I beg your attention to this observation. The New Testament considers all duration as divided into ages, or distant periods and states of existence; some temporal and some eternal. Before the creation of the world there was an eternity or infinite age. From the creation to the end of the world and day of judgment, are several temporal ages or dispensations of religion; after judgment there is to be another infinite or endless age. But since death divides the whole existence of man into two very different states and ages, a temporal and an eternal; and since his temporal age is connected with this visible world, so *aion* is sometimes used to express this distinction; the present age, is a scriptural expression for the present life and world; the age to come for the eternal world, in which man has an endless age. This view of the ages, temporal and eternal, will make the Scripture language upon the subject, plain and consistent; any other view will make it unaccountably perplexed, and utterly irreconcilable.†

* Aristotle, Philo, Phavorinus, and the Greek etymologists in general, derive *aion*,† from *aei*,‡ ever, and *on*,§ existing. Ever-existing duration is therefore the primary idea of the term. But the word is distinctly applied to the various respects in which eternity may be considered. 1st, Eternity may be considered simply and absolutely as without beginning, and, progression or succession. Such is the existence of God. In this sense Plato uses the term in his *Timæus*; and so do other writers. 2d, Eternity may be considered in reference to a particular point of time. Then there is a past and a future eternity. In this sense it is often used in Scripture, as well as by heathen and Christian writers. 3d, Eternity being thus connected with motion and change, may be considered as time ever moving onwards and producing successive events, some past, some passing, and some yet to come. As time in this absolute sense will never end, it is commensurate with future eternity. 4th, Eternity being thus united with time in general, comes to be considered as distinguished into various, successive parts, beginning with creation, when time began its course with the proper eternity, and will ever proceed with it. We the creatures of this world, naturally consider all duration as being either before the world, from the world to this or some remarkable period of time, or from any one period to another; as from the creation to the flood, from the flood to Moses, from Moses to Christ, from Christ to the end of the world, and from that onwards forever. Thus by an easy transition, *aion*|| was applied sometimes to signify certain periods of time, or certain states of things, as the world itself, &c. But when it refers to things before or after this world, it signifies eternity.

† This doctrine of the ages, temporal and eter-

† *aion* † *aei* § *on* || *aion*

I shall now give you some examples of the use of this word, premising, however, that it is employed in several forms and phrases: sometimes singly, "The word of the Lord abideth or standeth good [*eis ton aionan*] to the age, that is, to eternity."(1) "Christ continueth [*eis ton aionan*] to the eternal age."(2) "He that doeth the will of God abideth [*eis ton aionan*] to the age of eternity."(3) Christ promises his people [*ζωνη αιωνιον*] eternal life, and immediately adds that they shall not perish [*eis ton aionan*] to the age—to eternity.(4) One example more of this phrase. "For the wicked is reserved the blackness of darkness [*eis ton aionan*] to the age"(5) namely the same eternal age, during which the righteous shall not perish.

Sometimes the ages, in the plural is used for eternity. "Christ shall reign over his people [*eis tous aionas*] to the ages; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."(6) To strengthen the expression, the word is frequently doubled and compounded with itself. For example, "Thy throne, O God, is [*eis ton aionan tou aionos*] to the age of the age."(7) But to express eternity in the very strongest manner, this compound phrase is used in the plural number. "To God be glory [*eis tous aionas ton aionon*] to the ages of the ages."(8) And this phrase is never in the New Testament applied exclusively to the ages of time, but only to the ages of all futurity.

I have introduced these remarks, to prepare your minds for estimating the proper force of the argument which I shall now propose to you from the book of Revelation. In that book the strong phrase "the ages of the ages," is frequently used, and no other phrase of the same meaning is used. I shall mention all the subjects to which it is applied in that book. "To God be glory and power to the ages of the ages—that is forever and ever:"(9) "God liveth forever and ever:"(10) "Blessing and glory to HIM that sitteth upon the throne and to the lamb forever and ever:"(11) "I (says Christ) was dead and behold I am alive forever and ever."(12) "Her smoke (the smoke of mystical Babylon after her fall) ascendeth up forever and ever."(13)—her ruin shall be endless. "Christ shall reign forever

nal, is proved by a comparison of the texts in which *aion*† occurs. I shall cite a few. 1 Cor. x. 11. "Upon us [*ta tele ton aionon*] the ends of the ages have come:" that is, the last of the temporal ages or dispensations. Matt. xxiv. 3. [*tes sunteleias tou aionos*] "of the completion of the age;" that is of the world. 2 Tim. iv. 10. Having loved [*ton nun aionan*] the present age, life, or world. Matt. xii. 32. [*oute en touto aioni oute en to mellonti*]. Neither in this age, world, or state of being; nor in the future. Acts xv. 18. Known unto God [*ap' aionos*]*: from the age, that is the eternity before creation, were all his works. Examples of the future ages, after the end of the world, follow in the body of the discourse.

- (1) 1 Pet. i. 25. (2) Heb. vii. 24. (3) 1 John ii. 17.
(4) John x. 28. (5) Jude 13, and 2d Pet. ii. 17.
(6) Luke i. 33. (7) Heb. i. 8. (8) Gal. i. 5.
(9) Rev. i. 6. (10) iv. 9, 10, & x. 6. & xv. 7.
(11) v. 13, & vii. 12. (12) i. 18. (13) xix. 3.

† *aion*

† τα τελη των αιωνων

§ της συνηλειας τε αιωνος

|| του νυν αιωνα

† εις εν τε των αιωνι ους εν το μελλοντι. ** απ' αιωνος

and ever.”(1) “The redeemed in heaven shall reign forever and ever.”(2) There is but one more subject, to which the phrase is applied: “If any worship the beast and his image (that is, join the enemies of true religion) he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone—and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever.”(3) Again: “The devil that deceived the nations was cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet are, and they shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.—And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat thereon.—And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things written in the books according to their works.—And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.”(4)—namely that fire in which it had just been said the devil and the beast, and the false prophet and their followers, should be tormented forever and ever.”*

What things then saith the Spirit in the book of this prophecy, shall be *forever and ever*? Only these; the ruin of Christ's enemies represented by the mystical Babylon; the life, perfections, glory and reign of God and of Christ; the felicity of the redeemed in heaven: and the torments of the damned in the lake of fire.

But since this book, more than any other, unfolds the secrets of futurity, and carries its visions quite beyond the judgment into the abysses of eternity; perhaps it may afford some hint that the ages of ages of torment is not as long as the ages of ages of God and of heaven. Cheerfully would I find and

(1) Rev. xi. 15. (2) xxii. 5. (3) xiv. 10, 11. (4) xx. 10–15.

* It is alleged that *aion* cannot strictly signify eternity, because in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the particles *eti* and *epekeina* are sometimes added to give the greater emphasis. These examples occur: Exod. xv. 18. The Lord shall reign *ton aiona, kai ep' aiona kai eti*,§ forever and ever and farther. Dan. xii. 3. They shall shine as the stars *eis ton aiona kai eti*,|| forever and farther. Mic. iv. 5. We will walk in the name of the Lord *eis ton aiona kai epekeina*,¶ forever and beyond it.

I remark that these are not the only instances in which the Septuagint translators made bad Greek for the sake of making their version appear precisely literal. It was not to give explicitness to *aion*,** that such particles are a few times added; for the classical Greek writers and the apostles never felt the need of such an addition when they wanted to express eternity. It was to give what seemed a literal rendering of the Hebrew phrase,†† literally in English forever and ever, that they added *eti* and *epekeina*,‡‡ §§ both mean *ever*, or eternity by themselves, when applied to things capable of eternal duration. Both are joined for the same reason that we join *ever* to *forever*; not because each singly does not fully express the thing intended, but because the union of both gives the mind a stronger impression of it.

† *aion* ‡ *eti* & *epekeina* § *ton aiona, kai ep' aiona*
 ¶ *eis ton aiona kai eti* || *eis ton aiona kai epekeina*
 ** *aion* †† *eti* & *epekeina*

עלם & ער §§ לעלם וער ††

improve such a hint. We hear indeed of death and Hades being cast into the lake of fire.* But this only informs us, that after the resurrection of all the dead, temporal death and Hades (or the intermediate state of souls between death and judgment) will have lost their power, and, as if they were condemned persons, will be consigned to punishment, for hurting the people of God.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. Ruffner assumes the position, that the prophet Daniel (xii. 2.) speaks of a resurrection posterior to the present mode of being. But the first verse teaches a different doctrine. The Spirit, who taught Daniel in a vision, commences, as related in the tenth chapter, and informs Daniel that he “is come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people [the Jews,] in the latter days; for yet the vision is for days.” Not for another world, nor for, or to, eternity. The Spirit continues his instructions to the close of the book, the 12th chapter. Mr. R.'s quotation is a part of this, which is confined to the Jewish people, and to this mode of being. The Spirit says, “At that time shall Michael [Christ] stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people; [the Jews;] and there shall be a time of trouble, such as *never was*,” &c. It is at this time that “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” &c. Mr. R. believes, *all* that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake at the general resurrection. The time spoken of, therefore, is the time of Christ, who quotes the very words of Daniel, applies them to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the end of the Mosaic economy. John v. contains a parallel passage. Mr. R. is altogether mistaken relative to the meaning of this passage.

Mr. R.'s next paragraph is childish. When the premises fall, the conclusions fall with them. Sir, we will tell you what we understand. We understand from Christ's language, that the punishment and the life spoken of, are the punishment and the life of the age. A person may “go into this punishment,” may endure the punishment a year, ten years, or a day. The punishment is the punishment of the age. The penitentiary system of the state of New-York, is the punishment of the age. Sir, can not a person go into this punishment, unless the party remains in the penitentiary as long as the penitentiary system lasts? “Common sense” teaches, that a person may go into *aionion* or *agion* punishment, and not remain suffering this punishment one year. The same of the life. The life is a consequence of knowledge, or faith of the party.

* Rev. xx. 14. Hades, sometimes rendered the grave, and sometimes Hell, is never used in Scripture like Gehenna, for the place of final punishment; but for the place where departed souls dwell until the resurrection. In it is Paradise assigned to the righteous, where our Saviour's soul abode while separated from the body. There, too, is a separate place for the wicked, who undergo some sufferings, but not as great as when they shall be cast body and soul into the lake of fire. See Campbell on the Gospels. Prelim. Dissert. vi.

When a man's faith departs, his *aionion* life is gone. But the consequence, the *aionion* life, remains to all who have the faith. All Mr. R.'s conclusions, derived from his premises, making the life and punishment posterior to this world, are weaker than a cobweb.

Mr. R. continues, "Paul says, that the wicked at the day of judgment shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. 2 Thess. i. 9." He adds, "Here is still the same word in Greek." Sir, Paul, does not say this shall happen at the "*day of judgment*." However, we admit it. Read Matt. xvi. 27, 28, and the other passages we have quoted to prove that Christ came about 1800 years ago. Sir, the same Jerusalem or Jews, are spoken of. "Cry unto Jerusalem that her warfare is accomplished; that her iniquities are pardoned, for she hath received at the Lord's hand *double* for all her sins." (Isa. xl. 2.)

Mr. R. Continues—"Our Saviour says in Matthew, 'It is better,' &c. "than to be cast into *everlasting* fire." True, Sir, the *aionion* fire. Mr. R. quotes from Mark ix. 43, 44. "It is better for thee to go into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*," &c. Mr. R. adds, "The fire which in Matthew is (*aionios*) everlasting; is a fire that *never shall be quenched*," &c. Sir, we ask you, solemnly, Are you so ignorant of the original Greek of Griesbach, as not to know that the words "*never shall be*," which you handle so adroitly, are not to be found there? Or, Sir, are you privy to this fact, and calculating upon the ignorance of your readers, have you undertaken to deceive them, and palm upon them for the words of Christ, that, which you *know* Christ never spoke? The reader shall judge of your demerit. You, Sir, know, if you are qualified for a professor of languages, that the words "*never shall be*," which the translators have printed in the text, are not to be found in any correct Greek Testament! How dare you, Sir, say, "Here then is an *inspired* definition of everlasting punishment?" How dare you say, "Our Saviour adds, that *there* the wicked are the prey of a *never-dying* worm, and of fire *not quenched*?" Sir, you know, unless your ignorance is lamentable, that Christ speaks altogether in the *present tense*. Christ says, "It is better," &c. "that," &c. "to go," &c. "where their worm dieth not, and the fire *is* not quenched." Christ adds, "For *every one* shall be salted with fire." Paul says, (1 Cor. iii. 11-15.) "For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest. For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." While the party is *in hell, Gehenna*, their worm exists—the fire *is* not quenched. Our Saviour

never said the "wicked are the *prey* of a *never-dying* worm." It is *their* worm. It is *the* fire.

This was addressed to Christ's disciples, who had usurped an unjustifiable authority over the consciences of others. Sir, we tell you, you had better cut off your hand; that is, divest yourself of all that is opposed to the "God who is the Saviour of *all men*," and enter into his favour, which is life, maimed, than to have all your honours and emoluments, and suffer the anxiety, suspense, doubt, and apprehension, which you now do. The world would consider you as *maimed*, no doubt. Will you consider the life spoken of to be a future heaven; and that men go there *maimed*? Sir, is heaven to be filled with *invalids*, and hell with athletic men of *perfect form*? Now, Sir, repeat your interrogation—"If its guilty victims should ever rise to heaven, or sink to annihilation; how should it be *everlasting, unquenched, unquenchable, never-to-be quenched* fire, with a worm that dies not?" Ans. Christ gives no such account of the fire, &c. We have shown that the *fire* of hell is *wickedness*; that the *people* who are wicked are the *fuel*. You ask—"If the *fuel* of the fire, [the people,] and the food of the worm, be ever consumed, the fire is extinguished, and the worm dies." Very good, Sir; read the prophet Malachi, iv. 1. "For behold the *day* cometh, [not the eternity] that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do *wickedly*, shall be *stubble*; and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither *root* nor *branch*." Sir, please to answer—Is the *fire* spoken of by the prophet, and the *fire* of Gehennan alike; that is, the *same*? You must answer, No. For the fire of Gehennan is *wickedness*, and the fire spoken of by the prophet, is the fire of *God's day*; God's fire, (and the question is asked, "Is not my *word* as a fire?") which will destroy the wicked. The fire of Gehennan, Sir, according to you, will *preserve* the wicked! Alas! for the man who vindicates error against the truth. Sir, the Lord of hosts has said, the wicked shall be destroyed *root* and *branch*. You have decided, that when this happens, "the fire is extinguished, and the worm [of the carcass] dies." Thus, Sir, the testimony of God, and your own conclusion destroys your dear-bought premises!!!

Mr. R. in his note in the margin, acknowledges the truth relative to the derivation of the word rendered *Hell*. But his declaration, that "the name of it [the valley] was afterwards frequently applied to the place of *future* punishment," is destitute even of the shadow of truth; unless we qualify it by supposing the word *afterwards*, to refer to a time posterior to Christ, when the corruptions of the present day were generated, and the truth held in unrighteousness. Mr. R. again harps upon his *never-dying* worm. He says, the prophet Isaiah, lxvi. 22, "says, their fire, contrary to other fires, shall not be quenched," &c. Sir, the prophet says no such thing. He draws no comparison whatever. We read, Levit. vi. 13, "The fire shall *ever be burning* upon the altar; it shall *never go out*." Pray, Sir, what Greek words are used here? Has the fire

gone out upon the Jewish altars? Are the dead *carcasses* of the men, and the *men* one and the same? They do not look upon the men, only upon their carcasses. The carcasses, not the men, shall be an abhorring, &c. We must love all men, not abhor them. It is the carcasses of the men who have transgressed against God. Sir, have you ever transgressed? What will become of your carcass? Will you always remain in it? Your carcass may be abhorred, even by your dearest friends and relatives. Paul abhorred his own carcass, and cried, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the *body* of this death?" (Rom. vii. 24.) Paul transgressed. Do all transgressors die? How did it happen to Paul? Let Paul speak—"Sin revived, and I died." (Rom. vii. 9.)

Mr. R. in his next paragraph says, "As *aionios* signifies eternal, so *aion* its substantive, signifies ever or *eternity*, in its original proper sense." This declaration is to be understood of these words in the abstract. So we must believe that *aion*, (substantive,) means eternity, an *endless* duration. The adjective *aionios*, or *aionion*, (derived from it,) means eternal, or *never-ending*. Surely, this is plain. But we are immediately told, "*sometimes* it [*aion*] signifies an *age*, dispensation, or state of being." It appears, then, from Mr. R.'s concessions and assertions, that the "original proper sense" of the word *aion*, is "sometimes *ever* or *eternity*;" and "sometimes an *age*," &c. He asks, "How then can we know its exact meaning in a particular place?" He answers—"By this plain rule; when it relates to things belonging only to this *visible world*, it necessarily [remember this, *necessarily*] bears a limited sense," &c. Thus, reader—"The word *aion* in its original proper sense, signifies *eternity*." But in "its original proper sense," it is "sometimes necessarily limited." Shall we say the inspired writers used this word *properly*? Certainly. They "necessarily limited the word," by applying it to the things of the "present visible world." Therefore, according to Mr. R., this word has an indeterminate meaning. It appears that *aionios* applied to visible things, signifies *temporal*, or temporary! Sir, we deny this. Paul says, agreeably to your quotation, "the things which are seen are *proskaira* temporal, or for a time; but the things which are not seen are *aiona*." (Sermon p. 18, 19.) We ask you, Sir, if the word *aion* can be used as a synonyma for *proskaira*? The word *aion* signifies *age*; whether the age of an infant of a day, or the age of Jehovah's eternity. Does the English word *age* signify temporal, or for a time?

Again: You say, "sometimes it [*aion*] signifies a *state of being*." By the word *state*, we must understand the condition or circumstances of the being spoken of. Let us test this. The condition of the damned, according to Mr. R., is a *miserable* one, attended with *dreadful* circumstances. Does the word *aion* ever signify miserable and dreadful? We regret, Sir, that you have not proved and illustrated some of your important propositions. Take your text. "These shall go away into *kolasin aionion*." Does the word *aionion* signify the con-

dition or circumstances of the being of the party, or the word *kolasin*? The word *kolasin* signifies correction. The condition and circumstances of the party are therefore signified by the word *kolasin*. The party had a being before, but now go into a different *state* of being; which is defined by the word *kolasin* to be a state of *correction*. We now arrive at the proper distinction. The word *aionion* relates to the *nature* of the correction, and not to the duration of it.* That is, to the *properties* of the correction, and not to its continuance. The question must be answered—What are the properties of the correction—the punishment? Will the punishment eventuate in the *good* or *evil* of the punished? Read the prophet Ezekiel, (xvi.) and answer—"Thou shalt remember thy ways and be ashamed," &c. "And I will establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord." Not if you will make a covenant with me; but "I will establish my covenant." Sir, you must answer—Did not the Jews, spoken of by the prophet, "go into the everlasting punishment?" Will they remain there, after God has established his covenant with them—after they have remembered their ways, and been ashamed—after they have known the Lord? (See Psa. lxxvi. 9; xxii. 27.) Sir, it is the correction of the age which is spoken of. It is the nature or property of the correction of the age to benefit the corrected. They are corrected, they remember their ways, and the Lord establishes his covenant with them. A glorious consummation. Let every heart rejoice, and every tongue proclaim, "Praise ye the Lord. O give thanks unto the Lord; for *he is good*: for his mercy *endureth* for ever." (Psa. cvi.) But how long shall the correction continue? Ans. Until the party is *corrected*—ashamed, &c. Therefore, it is the nature or property of the correction, to make the party corrected remember their ways, and be ashamed. Then, God "establishes his covenant with them;" and they know that he is the Lord. A prophet says, "They that know thy name will put their trust in thee."

Mr. R. introduces Aristotle and others for authority; and says, "the Greek etymologists in general, derive *aion* from *aei*, ever, and *on*, existing." Sir, we appeal to you for the truth of the assertion, that Aristotle, and others of the most learned Greek writers, used and applied the word *aion*, as we use and apply the English word *age*. Pray, Sir, if the substantive signifies *ever-existing*, what does the adjective *aionion* signify? You answer, of *aionios*, that it signifies *eternal*. What does *eternal* signify? Ans. *Endless*. What does *endless* signify? Ans. *Ever-existing*. Consequently, your rule must destroy all distinction. Take your quotation in your marginal note, 1 Cor. x. 11. "Upon us the *ends* of the *ages* have come: [*ta tele ton aionon*]." (Spelled with omega.) Surely we must understand, according to your primary ideas of the substantive, and your application of the word properly, &c. that a number,

* Remember, the age spoken of has been proved to be different from every other which preceded or shall follow it. See Rom. xi. 7—12.

a plurality of eternities have ended; because you contend that *one aion*, signifies a proper eternity. You add, "that is, the *last* of the temporal ages or dispensations." The last, remember this. The last came upon Paul and his compeers. Sir, the writer of the Apocalypse, posterior to this time, spoke of a plurality of ages as coming. Were they temporal, that is, relating to this mode of being? You have decided in the negative; therefore you make the inspired writer to speak absurdly. The *ages* are all gone by. There remains only an infinite duration, undistinguished by periods, ages, or dispensations. The absurdity of your views is still more apparent from the use you make of Matt. xxiv. 3: namely, "[*tes sunteleias tou aionos*]; of the completion of the world." We presume you mean all sublunary things;—all the ages. Christ assured his disciples, in the 34th verse, that "that generation should not pass" until, according to Mr. R., the world should end. Mr. R. then quotes Matt. xii. 32, and, with the help of the printer probably, erroneously. It reads thus—"oute en touto to aiona, oute en to mellonti." He gives as the translation, "Neither in this age, world, or state of being, nor in the future." In p. 33, he says, "Neither in this world, nor the world to come." Here is another definition of the word *aion*! Sir, the original signifies just this—"neither in this, nor in the coming age." For, in despite of your sophistry, there has been, to say the least, one age since. The word *mellonti* signifies *coming*, and not only coming, but coming immediately. Sir, you know this well. A Professor of Languages cannot be so ignorant as you appear to be when it favours your hypothesis.

Mr. R.'s numerous quotations do not affect the subject under consideration; therefore we shall not fatigue the reader with useless repetitions. We will notice his quotation from Jude 13. This appears to be an error. A correct reading of the passage is as follows:—"to whom the blackness of darkness is reserved to the age." Also, from Gal. i. 5. "To God be glory, [*eis tous aionas ton aionon*] to the ages of the ages." Mr. R. says, "This phrase is never in the New-Testament applied exclusively to the ages of time, but only to the ages of all futurity." Sir, you have decided that the last of the *temporal* ages ended in Paul's time. That an eternal age was coming. Now, we have ages upon ages! all of them eternal! What a predicament! Sir, why was not this emphatic phrase used in your text? Thus—"These shall go away into punishment to the ages of the ages." Instead of the simple adjective *aionion*, the whole of your long phrase. Why should an inspired writer think it necessary to multiply words, when, according to you, the potent word *aionios* would have answered his purpose effectually? We ask you, Sir, have not ages of ages already passed? Can that which has an end be eternal? You must answer, No! Thus all your labour is for nought.

Mr. R. continues his quotations quite into the book of Revelation. There he finds a strong phrase applied to those who worship the beast and his image. Sir, it is declared of the beast, that he shall

"continue forty-two months." (Rev. xiii. 5.) The same time that the "holy city shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles; forty-two months." (Rev. xi. 2.) Can the beast be worshipped for a longer time than he continues? It is while the beast is worshipped, that the worshippers are tormented. We find that the phrase for ever and ever, [*eis aionas aionon*], is limited to forty-two months. This, according to the usual calculation of prophetic time, is 1260 years. Sir, eternity is forty-two months! Here you must stop. Mr. R. introduces a quotation from Rev. xx. 11-15. He says they were cast into "that fire in which it had just been said the Devil and the beast, and the false prophet and their followers, should be tormented *for ever and ever*." True, Sir, but you will recollect, for ever and ever, in this place, means only "forty-two months;" and that it is in this mode of being, while "the holy city is trodden under foot of the Gentiles." More than this, you must be classed with infidels, unless you admit the declarations of inspired writers to be truth. We read, (Heb. ii.) of Christ's destroying the Devil. Sir, will you explain, how the Devil can exist endlessly in fire, after he is destroyed "root and branch?"

Mr. R. then refers us to a note in the margin. It appears the "Septuagint translators made bad Greek, for the sake of making their version appear precisely literal." If you please, in plain English, the translators of the Hebrew of the Old Testament into Greek, knew full well that the phrase *ton aiona* signified nothing more than *to the age*. Therefore, they added *kai ep' aiona kai eti*. Wonderful to relate, the Septuagint writers were not "classical Greek writers;" for these, and the apostles never felt the need of such an addition when they wanted to express eternity. Astonishing! When the apostles wanted to express a long time, that is, more than one age, or a number of ages, the Greek substantive and its derivatives were all in requisition. But, when they wanted to express an endless duration, the longest possible, the substantive alone, or *one* of its derivatives was found sufficient! We must confess our surprise that a gentleman of Mr. R.'s standing and abilities, should venture his hypothesis, for a moment, on board of so flimsy a vessel. Alas! even the apostles made bad Greek too! It is a fact, which all the sophistry in the world can never destroy, that the English words *for ever*, when given as the translation of the Greek words *ton aiona*, are restricted to signify *for the age*. Also, the word everlasting for *aionion*, is *age-lasting*. If the words for ever and everlasting, primarily signify, of necessity, when abstractly considered, an endless duration, they cannot be a translation of the Greek words *ton aiona*, and *aionion*.

Mr. R. says, "But since this book, [Revelation,] more than any other, unfolds the secrets of futurity, and carries its visions quite beyond the judgment into the abysses of eternity; perhaps it may afford some hint that the ages of ages of torment is not so long as the ages of ages of God and heaven. Cheerfully would I find and improve such a hint." Sir, we will furnish you with hints; and we most ar-

dently hope you will improve them. You have assumed the position that the things spoken of in this book relate to another mode of being. We ask you, Was not the judgment, agreeably to Rev. xiv. 6, 7, simultaneous with the preaching of the gospel? You must answer this in the affirmative, or deny the testimony. Sir, we can prove, if opportunity were granted us, that this book was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Also, that nothing is spoken of in the book which has any relation to events posterior to that period, except the continuance of the antichristian power on the earth, the present consequences attendant on the rejection of the gospel, &c. See chap. i. 19, "Write the things which thou *hast* seen, [in the past tense,] and the things which *are*, [in the present tense,] and the things which shall be hereafter," [in the future tense.] That is, the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the dispensation of types and shadows, the introduction of the gospel dispensation, under the figure of the new Jerusalem, which immediately took place of the old, and the judgment, represented in the 20th chapter. You, Sir, will readily admit that the language of this book is highly figurative. Therefore, you must consider the figures as figures, as symbolical representations, and not as a literal narration of events.

Paul (Heb. xii. 22.) says, "But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," &c. Sir, unless the new, or heavenly Jerusalem has come, Paul and his companions could not come unto it. You lay great stress upon the literal reading of chapter xx. Consider the great white throne to represent the exaltation of Christ, a Prince and a Saviour. The heaven to be the Jewish church and worship; and the earth the Jewish temporal dominion. "To be carnally minded is death." Therefore, the carnally minded are the dead small and great. The books of nature and the law are opened; and "another book was opened." Sir, what book is this? Is it not the Gospel? Was not this book sealed to Daniel the prophet? Compare Dan. xii. and Rev. xx. xxi. xxii. to verse 10 of last chapter: "Life and immortality were brought to light by the Gospel." Then the Gospel is the book of life. The life spoken of is the *agion* life, the consequence of knowing God. (See John xvii. 3.) This is the life the party enjoys, for he finds his name written there. The life itself is brought to light by the book; brought to the party; he sees, believes, and rejoices. Sir, "this is quite beyond the judgment." This other book was not opened until the judgment commenced. Christ declared, (John xii. 31, 32.) "Now is the judgment of this world." [Nun krisis esti tou kosmou toutou.] Now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw *all* unto me." (Not a part.) Now, that is, this generation. See Rev. xxii. 12. "Behold, I come quickly." IMMEDIATELY. Not thousands of years hence. Thus, Sir, you may discover that the judgment commenced with the preaching of

the Gospel, the opening of the books, about 1800 years ago. Does it not follow, that the "ages of torment" are swallowed up in the past and passing ages? Remember the "forty two months."

Mr. R. adds—"We hear indeed of death and Hades being cast into the lake of fire. But this only informs us, that after the resurrection of all the dead, temporal death and Hades, or the intermediate state of souls between death and judgment, will have lost their power, and, as if they [that is, death and Hades,] were condemned persons, will be consigned to punishment for hurting the people of God." Astonishing! Sir, the judgment is in this mode of being. How can temporal death and the grave be punished? Tormented, if you please. Are they susceptible of suffering or correction? Certainly not. What is the lake of fire? Will it *preserve, purify, or destroy*? Is temporal death and Hades to be preserved, purified, or destroyed? Most assuredly, destroyed. God says, (Hosea xiii. 14.) "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; [Sheol or Hades;] I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction."

Mr. R. refers us to a note in the margin, on Rev. xx. 14. where he says, "Hades, sometimes rendered *grave*, and sometimes *Hell*, is never used in scripture like Gehenna, for the place of final punishment; but for the place where departed souls dwell until the resurrection." Sir, you are correct, so far as to reject the foolish notion of the rich man in the parable, Luke xvi. being consigned to endless misery. But you must produce testimony to prove that Gehenna is spoken of as a place of final punishment. You have confessed that Gehenna is a valley contiguous to Jerusalem. You add, "In it [Hades the grave] is *Paradise*, assigned to the righteous, where our Saviour's soul abode while separate from the body. There too is a separate place for the wicked, who undergo *some* suffering, but not as great as when they shall be cast body and soul into the lake of fire." To prove this, you refer the reader not to the Scriptures, but to "Campbell's Prelim. Dissert. vi." Sir, you are right. The Scriptures will not answer. You must go to human traditions. Hear what inspiration says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth [Sheol, Hades] as it was; and the Spirit to God who gave it." (Eccles. xii. 7.) Hades receives its part. "God has been our dwelling place in all generations;" and will be to all coming ages. (See Psa. xc. 1, 2, omit the word *art* which is a supply.) How can Paradise lie in the dirt, the dust, the earth, the grave? When all men are finally raised incorruptible and immortal, (1 Cor. xv.) how can they suffer? Sir, examine the Scriptures, and you will learn, that Hades never receives any thing but the dust of the ground, out of which the earthy man was formed. The body which shall be raised, is not dust and corruption, but a spiritual body. Sir, *matter* will never be changed into *spirit*. We must be raised in the heavenly image, incorruptible and immortal. "That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*; that which is born of the spirit is *spirit*; flesh and blood, [dust] cannot inherit the

* Not *aionos*, age. Now, this generation, commences the judgment.

kingdom of God. Behold, I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." How? Ans. "We shall be raised *incorruptible*." Be freed from flesh and dust. Hear the voice of triumph—"O death, where is thy sting? O grave, [Hades,] where is thy victory?" Will you, Sir, say, that Hades is destroyed only to give place to a lake of fire, a greater evil? Sir, if you add unto these things, "God shall add unto you the plagues that are written in the book."

(To be continued.)

ADDRESS

Of the Carrier of the Gospel Herald to his Customers.

The wheels of TIME their annual course have run, And, lo, another year has just begun. Again your Carrier must resume his pen, To hail his Patrons and kind friends again; He fondly hopes that through the year that's fled Heaven's choicest blessings on you have been shed; He hopes that Health has your attendant been, And that you have experienced Peace within; And, above all, that Wisdom from above Has taught you to revere the GOD OF LOVE.

How many since my last address to you, Who then had prospects bright and fair in view, Now sleep in silence in the dark cold grave, Or lie entomb'd beneath the briny wave! How many have been call'd on to attend The funeral rites of some dear valued friend; But, oh, how happy must the Christian be, Who knows the truth, that truth which made him free! He can rejoice that Death will be destroy'd; That man no more by him shall be annoy'd,— He will submit to the afflictive rod, For 'tis the hand of the Almighty God, Who chastens all the children of his love, Weans them from earth, fixes their thoughts above, Gives them that peace of mind that inward joy, Which no bereavement ever can destroy: Thus while on earth they taste the joys of heaven, Through faith in him by whom they are forgiven.

Again my friends, I must congratulate You on our country's happy prosperous state, Favour'd of Heaven our wide and vast domain Smiles under Freedom's mild and genial reign; From the Niagara's loud and thundering roar To the Atlantic's wide extended shore, From where the Mississippi's waters glide, To the St. Lawrence's majestic tide Fair Freedom smiles o'er mountains, hills, and plains, And universal harmony here reigns. No despot here dare raise his impious hand To mar the blessings of our happy land; No foreign tyrant dare invade the soil Which has been freed by so much blood and toil; No inquisition here can ask us, why We worship God with perfect liberty? No church establishment can here distract The poor man's hard earn'd honest gain; Richly above all other nations blest, We here can worship God as we think best. How grateful then to Him ought we to be, For civil and religious liberty!

But when we cast our eyes to Europe's shore, We see the sword unsheath'd and stain'd with gore: There we behold the name of God profan'd, The passions of the ignorant inflam'd, And even Religion made a pretext for A most unjust and mercenary war. Priestcraft, that child of hell in every age, Has fill'd the earth with violence and rage:

Priestcraft has robb'd the worthy of his food, And prompted man to spill his brother's blood; Depriv'd the widow of her scanty mite, Cheated the orphan of his honest right, Burn'd at the stake those who did dare confess That he is Lord who is Our Righteousness; And even here, where Freedom's banner waves, Priestcraft I fear can boast of many slaves.

Patrons and Friends of Truth, all hail! You can rejoice, that Truth shall never fail. You can rejoice that the bless'd time will come When all will build upon the Corner Stone; When wars and tumults on the earth shall cease, When there will be an Universal Peace. When he whose right it is to reign, shall reign, And every tongue confess his glorious name: When every knee shall bow and own him Lord, And no more doubt his true unerring word. When the whole race of Adam shall combine, And the angelic hosts their voices join, To praise the Being they shall then adore, God above all, blessed for evermore.

Patrons and Friends, accept my humble lay, For your prosperity I still will pray,— Fear not, while you have *Truth* upon your side, Though *Error's* votaries may your cause deride: Fear not, while *Wisdom* leads you on her way, Though *Folly's* snares may tempt your feet to stray: Fear not, while Jesus is your faithful Friend, For whom he loves he loves unto the end. May the new year a year of plenty be, A year of health and of prosperity: In basket and in store may you be bless'd; May you adorn the faith you have profess'd; With all men live in peace, in harmony and love, And may the God who sits in heaven above, Crown all your efforts while you sojourn here, And bless you through a never-ending year.

New-York, January 1, 1824.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Subscribers to the Gospel Herald are respectfully informed, that in consequence of the receipt of only a *small* proportion of the subscriptions to the Paper, the Establishment is greatly embarrassed in its pecuniary resources; so much so, as to render it doubtful whether the Herald can be issued for a longer time than to complete the third quarter of the year. Therefore, unless the Subscribers, who have not paid, can be prevailed upon to forward the amount of their subscriptions to the Treasurer, immediately, the Association will have no other alternative but to discontinue the Paper at the expiration of the third quarter, or to advance the necessary means from their own private funds, to continue it to the completion of the Volume. Subscribers, therefore, are most earnestly solicited to relieve the Establishment, by forwarding, without delay, the sums due from them, respectively, to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—2 CHRONICLES XVIII. 22.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 8 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1824.

NO. 36.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"These shall go away into everlasting punishment."

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(Continued from p. 275.)

We hear in the same place of the second death. But that affords no hope; for to be cast into the lake of fire is expressly called the second death, and the only consequence mentioned is torment forever and ever.*

On the other hand the book of this prophecy gives indirect but unequivocal evidence, that the guilty dwellers in the fiery lake can never hope for deliverance. You have just heard of the book of life. We are told in another chapter that the names of some men were, and the names of the rest were not, written in that book from the foundation of the world. The book of life is therefore the eternal foreknowledge of God. But those not written in that book are to be cast into the lake of fire; and they, we are assured in the prophecy, shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven, but only they whose names are in the book of life.† If they were excluded only for a season, they would have been as certainly inscribed in the book of life from the foundation of the world, as the others; for difference of time makes no difference in Divine foreknowledge; nor could it be truly said that only the part found in the book at the day of judgment should enter heaven. All would enter after a while.

* If we suppose the second death must needs be like the first, all that can be inferred from it is the dissolution of the body. To affirm that it will either annihilate the soul, or transfer the sinner to heaven, is mere unwarranted assertion. The first death produces no such effects, or the wicked would not need the second death to produce them. And after the second death will the soul go to heaven *bodiless*, and thus be inferior to the other saints? Or will there be a resurrection of the body after the second death? Where has God revealed any such things? And who can know them without revelation.

Some divines have supposed, from the punishment of the wicked being sometimes called destruction, perishing, &c.; and from the mention of the second death; that the penal fire would finally consume the bodies of the wicked, and leave their souls an everlasting prey to remorse and despair. This is at least as far as (I think farther than) the language of scripture will warrant us to go.

† Rev. xvii. 8. and xxi 27.

Yet notwithstanding, had we an intimation that the wicked were to be sanctified by their pains, hope might still glimmer upon their dark abode. But revelation opens no thought of that kind. Hell is often described as a place of wrath, vengeance, punishment; never as a place of purification. This prophecy excludes the idea. After the vision is closed—the judgment over,—the righteous in glory,—the wicked in torment;—the judge himself proclaims to the prophet; "He that is unjust and filthy, let him be unjust and filthy still; he that is righteous and holy, let him be righteous and holy still."‡ Facts forbid us to refer this sentence to the present life, where unjust men may and do become righteous. It must be referred to some state where characters become unchangeably good or bad. Necessity, and the connexion of the discourse, direct us to heaven and hell for the application.

I shall close the scripture proof with two more texts, the one directly affirming, the other necessarily implying eternal punishment.

Our Saviour assures us there is a sin absolutely unpardonable. The declarations concerning the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost, found in three of the Gospels,† are these: "He shall not be forgiven;"—he shall not be forgiven [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] to eternity (the very phrase used by Christ in relation to his people; They shall not perish; [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] to eternity)—but he is bound over‡ to eternal damnation;§ (so in the place just alluded to, he said of his people, "I give unto them eternal life," using the same word αἰῶνος;)—he shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.¶ Language can go no further in giving emphatical explicitness to a doctrine. I remark only that the Scriptures make no distinction in the duration of different men's future punishment. The blasphemer against the Holy Ghost cannot escape

* Rev. xxii. 11. † Luke xii. 10. Mark iii. 29. Mat. xii. 31.

‡ *Enochos*,|| in danger is the common translation; but here at least the word signifies unavoidable liability.

§ *Aioniou kriseos*.¶ So Heb. vi. 2. *aioniou krimatos*,** eternal judgment. But why called eternal except for its consequences? And why so, if its consequences be but temporary to the wicked? But in truth the scripture language concerning the judgment always declares or implies the eternity of its decisions.

¶¶ The word here translated *world* is *aion*,¶¶ which being distinguished into present and future, signifies the two ages or states of man, the temporal and eternal. It cannot mean two ages or period of

|| ενοχος || ἀεικρίστιος ** αἰῶνος κριματός ¶¶ αἰών

it; others may by timely repentance; but if they neglect that, they and all are consigned to the same doom.

The second text is this expression of Christ: "Woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed; it were good for him not to have been born." (Matt. xxvi. 24.) He delivers this sentiment as his own, and the correctness of it depends upon Judas Iscariot's suffering more than he ever did or will enjoy. An eternity of heaven's bliss would make it infinitely good for him to have been born, however long a purgatory he would have to pass through to heaven.

Want of time, not of matter, obliges me here to close the scripture testimony. Were the evidence as clear in favour of your personal admission into heaven, I am sure you would esteem it satisfactory. But hard as it is for sinful mortals to receive the doctrine, its scripture evidence has subdued the prejudices of Christians generally in every age, from the days of the apostles.

It has been asserted that our translations deceive us in these latter times; that education and habit lead us to affix a wrong sense to words, &c. To disprove such assertions, I have dealt much with the original, I hope so plainly as to show the meaning of the inspired writers. To remove the whole pretence for such assertions, I will briefly state the testimony of the learned and pious Greek fathers of the first two hundred years after Christ. They received the gospel in their own language, fresh from the tongues and pens of the apostles. They speak of future punishment in these terms: "We teach that every man goes to eternal punishment or reward;—that the wicked, body and soul, shall suffer a punishment that is eternal, and not for a period of 1000 years, as the philosopher Plato says.—When Christ comes to judgment, he will send the bodies of the wicked endued with eternal feeling into eternal fire; and what kind of feeling they will have, may be judged from these sayings, *The worm shall not cease, and their fire shall not be quenched; then shall they repent, when they shall not profit by repentance. Their loss is eternal and without end.*"* Many and various expressions of this kind they use, to exclude all doubt of their meaning. With them the Latin writers of those times agree, declaring future punishments to consist in infinite torments to which there is no limit nor end.† Nor do they deliver these as only their private sentiments. They frequently state them as the undisputed doctrine of the church. So

time in this world, because both refer to the same person; it shall not be forgiven *him*, the individual sinner, neither in the present, &c. But this does not imply that other sins are forgiven in a future state; it is plainly and singly designated to cut off all manner of hope. It may allude to the day of judgment, when the saints shall be publicly forgiven.

* Justin Martyr Apol. i. Irenæus v. 27. *steresis autem aionios kai ateleitotos.*†

† Cyprian and Tertullian.

† *στερησις αυτου ααιωνιος και ατελειωτος*

that the whole church, Greeks and Latins, in the first ages after the apostles, understood from tradition and scripture, that eternal punishment was an unquestionable doctrine of the gospel.

Afterwards arose Origen, almost as fond of Plato's philosophy, as of the Gospel. He, after Plato, taught that mankind would be good and bad, happy and miserable by turns, forever. Yet he defended eternal rewards and punishments to be the doctrine of the church.* Few indeed but those counted heretics, ever departed from that doctrine.

Moreover, both Jews and heathens in our Saviour's time, generally believed that some men would be eternally punished. The Pharisees were of this opinion, and they were the most numerous and popular sect of the Jews. So we learn from Josephus.† Philo, a celebrated Jewish writer of the same age, says that punishment after death is, To live and be ever dying, and in a manner to suffer the pains of an endless death.

This being the common opinion; wherever the Gospel was first preached, upon a subject of infinite importance, we might expect our Saviour and his apostles to declare the true doctrine plainly; and if the common opinion were false, to abolish the tremendous error, by direct, unequivocal contradiction. So they usually dealt with prevailing errors. One error embraced by some Jews on this very point they did contradict with the utmost care and plainness—the opinion that the punishment of wicked Jews would be temporary, but of Gentiles eternal. How often do they teach us that there is no difference of that kind between Jew and Gentile.‡ But in all the places where it was their solemn purpose to teach us the whole truth concerning future punishment, do they no where deny its eternity or assert its limited duration? No, not in any place whatever. What then do they build upon, who thus deny and assert? Upon some texts which do not directly relate to the subject; and which are peculiarly capable, by themselves, of different interpretations; but considered in their whole connexion, are far from answering the intended purpose. I shall mention these chiefly relied upon, and briefly suggest how they are inapplicable or misconstrued.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. Ruffner's commentary on the book of Revelation will not edify his readers, nor increase their estimation of his ability as an expositor of the Scriptures. "We hear of the second death." True, Sir; how will the admission of your conclusion, that the second death "affords no hope," affect the main point under consideration? The Gospel affords hope. Paul declares of the creation, that God subjected them to vanity in hope. (Rom. viii.) There is hope, a hope of God's establishing, for all men. Some men may not enjoy the consolation arising from this hope; but, Sir, there is hope. Mr. R.'s note in the margin is a mere compilation of opinions, which do no honour to his head or heart. If

* Whitby on Heb. vi. 2. † Antiq. xviii. 1. Jewish War ii. 6. ‡ Rom. ii. 9-11.

the death of the *body* is the second death, the believer endures it as well as the unbeliever. Sir, we neither affirm that the "second death will annihilate the soul, nor transfer the sinner to heaven." Why do you attempt to prejudice the public mind, by these insinuations? Sir, your note is calculated to betray ignorance on your part, and to mislead and prejudice others. We do not judge and act from mere supposition. Those whom you call divines, may conjecture what they please; the Scriptures are our standard. God "*blots out*" the sinner's sins, and takes the *just* to heaven.

Mr. R.'s assertions are unwarrantable. He says, "On the other hand, the book of this prophecy gives indirect but unequivocal evidence, that the guilty dwellers in the fiery lake can *never hope* for deliverance. You have just heard of the *book of life*." True, Sir. Have you heard of the *book of death*? It appears you have a book of this description. Now we admit that some men's "*names* were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world." What are we to understand by the term *name*? That your name, *Henry Ruffner*, is written in the "Lamb's book of life?" You say, "the *book of life* is therefore the eternal *foreknowledge* of God." Wherefore? The reason you assign is, "that the names of some men were not written in that book." The contrary of this conclusion results from your premises. God foreknew all men. Are the names of all men written in the book of life? You have forgotten that the language of the Apocalypse is highly figurative, and that the figures agree with the prophecies. We read, (Rev. ii. 17.) of a "*new name*." Also, (iii. 12.) of writing upon men "the name of my God, the name of the city of my God," &c. "and my *new name*." Again, of the "*Father's name* written in their foreheads." (xiv. i.) Consider the woman, a figure of antichrist. "Upon her forehead a name written." What is it? Ans. "*Mystery*," &c. "the mother [author] of harlots [spiritual adulteresses] and abominations of the earth." (xvii. 5.) See 1 John v. 9-12. God has witnessed of his Son, in the *plain* language of truth. Antichrist, the "great whore," the woman, the mother of abominations, deals in *mystery*. They who worship the beast, a *destroyer*, instead of the *Lamb*, a Saviour, are deluded by her. She is the cause of murder and bloodshed, of war and misery. Christ writes upon, (that is, *teaches* men) the name of his God, which is *Father*, and his new name, which is Son, and the city of God. The Gospel is the book of life. Life and immortality are brought to light by it. The Gospel, or book of life, teaches life, and not death. All who read this book, find their names written therein. What is the name? Ans. Son. God is the Father. Hear Paul, "Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the *Spirit of adoption*, whereby we cry, Abba Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God;" or *sons*. (Rom. viii. 15, 16.) The reverse of this, the "spirit of bondage to fear," is the condition of those who worship the beast. The book of life is plain and easy. The forehead

of the mother of harlots is emblazoned with the word *mystery*. Her deluded votaries cannot see their name written in the book of life, from the foundation or beginning. God's Spirit, which is love, will not witness with their spirit, which is a "spirit of bondage to fear." The miserable followers of antichristian doctrines, have died the *first* death, become carnally minded, and they die the second death.

Mr. R. says, of those written in the book, "nor could it be truly said that only the part found in the book at the *day of judgment* should enter heaven." Sir, you take some liberty, in accommodating yourself to such terms and phrases as appear best in your eyes. However, we only request you to read Rev. xiv. 6, 7, to set you right. Having closed the judgment, vision, &c. you say, "the judge himself proclaims to the prophet, 'He that is unjust,'" &c. Sir, how do you know that the judgment is closed at this time? You have landed your sinners in *hell*, not in the lake of fire. Sir, the lake of fire is for the destruction of death and hell. Nearly *eighteen hundred* years ago, "the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must *shortly be done*." (Rev. xxii. 6.) It is then added, "Behold, I *come quickly*." Again. "He saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: [Why?] for the *time is at hand*. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still," &c. "Behold, [Look!] I come [When?] quickly: [*immediately*] and my reward *is* with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Again. "He which testifieth these things saith, *Surely I come quickly*." Sir, has Christ come, as above stated? Here is a cloud of witnesses. Christ declared, when in the flesh, that the generation to whom he spoke, should not pass away until the things spoken of should be fulfilled. He declared, (Luke xxi.) "*These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled*." And after this God sent his angel, and testified, nearly 1800 years ago, saying, "Behold, I come quickly." We do not wish to offend any creature living. But a love of truth compels us to say, that if infidelity consists in denying the asseverations of the Bible, the man who denies the declarations above quoted, is an infidel, with all his professions. Professions are mere *wind*. Read this—"If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." This leads us to the consideration of another particular.

A man may have his name written in the book of life, and, according to Mr. Ruffner's view of the time spoken of, another world, enter heaven, and afterwards be turned out! We read of the fruit of the tree of life, that it is for the healing of the nations. If this fruit will heal the nations, Mr. R.'s hell will not be wanted for that purpose. We reluctantly close our remarks on this part of Mr. R.'s Discourse; our limits not admitting a longer reply.

Mr. R. says, "Our Saviour assures us there is a sin *absolutely unpardonable*." This is a most *wicked* assertion. For our Saviour never used this mode of expression, nor any thing like it. Mr. R. con-

tinues—"The declarations concerning the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost, found in three of the gospels, are these: He shall not be forgiven;—he shall not be forgiven [*eis ton aiona*] to eternity," &c. Mr. R. continues, and jumbles the declarations related by the evangelists, to the confusion of the reader. Sir, your conduct is criminal. You cannot plead ignorance, but sin wilfully. You know, that your arrangement and use of these passages is unjustifiable. That you would chastise your pupils should they be guilty of a like conduct, in ordinary composition in their Greek exercises. When a man wishes the misery of his fellows, he will not hesitate to pervert the Scriptures to torment them. Sir, you shall be dealt honourably with. Your duplicity shall be exposed, and full liberty granted you to wear all your laurels. Out of your *own* mouth shall you be judged, thou wicked servant. Sir, in page 26, of your book, we read in your marginal note as follows, "2 Tim. iv. 10. Having loved [*ton nun aiona*] the present age, life or world." Also, "Matt. xii. 32, [*oute en touto aioni* *oute en to mellonti*]. Neither in *this* age, world, or state of being, nor in the future." You had forgotten this. In your 32d page, you make the word *aiona*, signify eternity, the very word which you acknowledge in p. 26, to signify *age*. You then pervert the declaration in Mark iii. 29, contending that the word *enochos*, rendered *danger*, signifies "bound over." Sir, when you read this, your conscience will inflict an adequate punishment. You will feel that "the way of the transgressor is *hard*." For your information (for we do not yet regard you as having arrived at the pinnacle of the temple of knowledge,) we mention, that the *aioniou kriseos* in Mark iii. 29, is the *judgment* spoken of in Rev. xiv. 6, 7, which commenced with the preaching of the gospel; where the same word which you delight to call *damnation*, is properly rendered *judgment*. Sir, the passage signifies just this, (and we appeal to *your* conscience for the truth of our declaration,) that the party spoken of hath not remission or forgiveness to the age, but is liable to the judgment of the age. It is said in Matt. xii. to this amount, The party shall not be forgiven neither in this nor the coming age. The coming age spoken of by Matthew, [at the end of the Jewish church,] answers to the judgment of the age in Mark. It is important to consider, that a "sin absolutely unpardonable," and a sin that is *not* pardoned, for a time, are two things. The sin is this, "Because they said he hath an *unclean* spirit." That is, the spirit of a Devil. If you could prove that God is moved by a spirit so malignant as never to forgive, but to torture endlessly those who sin against him, you would substantiate the charge. God forgives all sin. But while men accuse Him of possessing an unclean spirit, they cannot have remission of sin. God's mercy and love are infinite. All sin is finite. Mr. R. adds, "So in the place just alluded to, he said of his people, 'I give unto them eternal life,' using the same word *aionios*;—he shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come!" In his note, Mr. R. says, "The word here translated

world is *aion*!" Sir, you cannot be so ignorant as to mistake in this manner. You know the passage does not read "in this world, nor in the world to come." The word *aion* occurs but once, and the word *mellonti* signifies coming shortly. To our astonishment, we read the following, in Mr. R.'s note. "It cannot mean two ages or periods of time in this world, because both refer to the same person; it shall not be forgiven *him*," &c. Supposing you were to understand it as follows—He that blasphemeth, &c. shall not be forgiven in this age;—he that blasphemeth in the coming age, shall not be forgiven in the coming age. The declaration was made nearly at the close of the dispensation of the law. Or, neither in this, nor in the age soon coming, shall he or they who blaspheme, be forgiven. The ages spoken of refer to all who blaspheme in both ages. If you construe it to mean this mode of existence, or another mode of existence, you cannot avoid the conclusion, that all sin and blasphemy, with the exception of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, will be forgiven in another world. But Mr. R., with a view to avoid the difficulty, says, "It may allude to the day of judgment, when the saints shall be publicly forgiven." According to this, the saints are not forgiven only in another world! Mr. R., with all his show of pretensions, is at a loss how to understand the passage. Mr. R. also quotes "Heb. vi. 2. *aioniou krimatos*, eternal judgment." First prove that the word *aioniou* signifies eternal, before you (taking it for granted,) ask, "But why call it eternal, except for its consequences?"

We express our feelings and opinions, when we say, in reference to all unbelievers who have perverted the Scriptures, and tortured the anxious inquirer after truth, that society at large has been injured by them in a greater degree than by all the robbers of money and goods. Witness the wars and bloodshed which have grown out of this prolific cause of mischief. We never heard of a man hanging or drowning himself, for the loss of property taken by the highwayman, or housebreaker; but we have heard of many who have committed suicide from distraction produced by perversions of the Scriptures. To rob a man of his peace of mind, and send him to the *halter* for relief, is a more mischievous thing than to rob a man of his money. We are not *personal* in these remarks. We speak of the practice *generally*, of perverting the Scriptures; representing the God of Love as a cruel tyrant, and ruining the peace of mind of thousands. We are in a free country, and, God be praised, can express our sentiments; which are, that there is no crime recognized by the laws, which is so productive of human misery, and has been so injurious to society at large, as the crime of perverting the Scriptures. This abominable wickedness brought upon the Pharisees of old, the cutting reproofs of the Saviour, who justly called them "*serpents*," a "*generation of vipers*." They insidiously, with fair pretensions, destroyed the peace of mind of thousands; shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men, and representing God, the Father of all, as partial, and the enemy of his offspring. Religion, and every thing

deserving the name, is calculated to reconcile man to his lot; and to awaken confidence, love, and gratitude toward his Creator. God is *Love*; and his servants never represent Him at variance with love. Presuming that no apology is necessary for this digression, we proceed to the consideration of the Discourse.

Mr. R. continues—"The second text is this expression of Christ: 'Wo unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed; it were good for him not to have been born.'" (Matt. xxvi. 24.) All that can be said of this passage is, that Christ expressed *pity* for Judas, saying, "*Alas!* for that man." For all that can be gathered from the conclusion of the sentence is, that Christ expressed this sentiment—"Good were it [in the present tense] for that man if he were not [in the present tense] born." Mr. R. has varied the mode of expression from the common translation. He wishes to make Christ express an opinion that it would have been better for Judas *never* to have existed at all. This is a construction which the original will never bear. When we are writing, we consider that honest men of common sense, will examine our productions. We shall be detected if we cheat. If we descend to puerility, we shall have the credit of it. We cannot believe that Mr. R. would have written as he has, if something like these reflections had presented themselves. But we have a greater concern. The eye of Omnipotence beholds us with a scrutinizing look, and we must obey Him, and not man.

Every feeling within us—every sentiment we cherish—all knowledge that we possess of God's character and purposes, forbids our admitting, for a moment, that He would bring any man into being, if that being should prove a final curse to the man. The God we worship, and the *only* God whose existence we will acknowledge, is a God of LOVE. We will adopt the language of his prophet, and say, "I will sing of thy mercies for ever." Our God, and his Son, Jesus Christ, never expressed the abominable sentiment which Mr. R. has foisted upon the passage. He never "delivered this sentiment as his own," or the sentiment of any other, that Judas Iscariot's *sufferings* should exceed his *enjoyment*, taking into view the whole of his existence. Nor can we assent to the grammar or the reason of Mr. R.'s remark, that "An *eternity* of heaven's bliss would make it *infinitely* good for him to have been born, however *long a purgatory* he would have to pass through to heaven." Sir, what do the words "eternity and infinitely" signify? Pray inform us, how a man can be tormented millions of years, and pass an "infinitely good *eternity*" of happiness *afterwards*? It may answer for you, who deal in misery by wholesale, to approve of "long purgatories;" but for ourselves, we had rather never exist at all, than to be tormented in John Calvin's purgatory, for the short period of one hundred years. It would require an infinitely longer eternity than you have mentioned, for us to forget the smart of the pains, or to reconcile us to the being whose cruelty inflicted them. We are rooted and grounded in the belief, that a *Devil* is the only being in existence

who is pleased with the sight of *misery*. Also, that a Devil is the only being who wishes for its continuance. If there is an almighty Devil, we may be tormented for opposing his cruel reign. But we rejoice that the "LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT reigneth." Our destiny is in His hands, and we are *satisfied*. "The Lord is my light and my salvation, of whom shall I be *afraid*?" Therefore, it is perfectly useless to tell us of endless Hells, eternal Devils, and long purgatories. Sir, we rejoice that you, and all mankind are safe; for God is the Father, the unchangeable Friend of all his offspring.

Poor Judas, alas! for thee; there lives not the man whose bosom is warmed with so much as one spark of the fire that burned in the heart of Jesus, who will not express his compassion for thee. Alas! for the man who could let an avaricious disposition estrange him from the cause of so good, so kind a Master. How soon thy compunctions harrowed up thy soul, nerved thee with courage to defend his cause, and to assert his innocence and thy guilt, in the presence of his truly implacable enemies! Would to heaven that modern Judases, who betray their master, and forsake his cause, for money and honour, would repent as soon, and as sincerely as thou. While thine eleven compeers, who swore with thee to support thy Master's cause, were skulking with trembling affright, thou entered the judgment-hall, and asserted the innocence of thy Lord. Never was repentance more prompt, nor more sincere, than the repentance of Judas Iscariot. He made all the reparation in his power, and fell a victim to the anguish of a broken heart. He was choked with grief. We give Mr. R. credit for not introducing the stale objection, which originated in a mis-translation, that Judas *hanged himself*. It would appear, that Christ's expression was a proverbial saying among the Jews, in times of great calamity. Even the prophet Jeremiah (xx. 14-18.) cursed the day of his birth; wished he *had not been born*; and asks, "Wherefore came I forth to see labour and sorrow, that my days should be consumed with shame?"

We have already expressed astonishment at some of Mr. R.'s sayings, but here follows a declaration more wonderful still. He says, "Were the evidence as clear in favour of your personal admission into heaven, I am sure you would esteem it satisfactory." We have rubbed our eyes, and read this again and again, and we can make only this out of it, that, Were the evidence of the *salvation* of mankind, as *clear* as the evidence of their *damnation*, the reader might safely conclude he would go to heaven. Mr. R. infers this is not the case. Consequently, the probability is, the reader, or mankind, will be damned for want of *clear testimony!!!* Mr. R. adds, "But *hard* as it is for *sinful* mortals to receive the doctrine [of *clear* evidence in favour of endless damnation, and *cloudy* testimony in favour of salvation,] its scripture evidence has subdued the prejudices of Christians generally in every age, from the days of the apostles." It appears then, that the prejudices of sinners and Christians are, or have been, united against the doctrine of endless misery. Sir, the most cruel and abandoned wretches have been the

greatest sticklers for endless misery. Witness the horrid massacres and tortures of victims by the Romish church! To test the truth of the proposition, take John Calvin, a man who delighted in the anticipation of the endless wretchedness of three-fourths of the creation of God. The blood of the martyr SERVETUS cries from the ground. Do you call Calvin a Christian? If so, what do you call Christ? The antipodes are not more distant than their principles and practices. Calvin's prejudices against endless misery were *subdued*! Nothing can be more evident. He even considered the Hell to be ill-timed, and made one himself to torture and roast poor SERVETUS! This is certainly clear testimony. The only difficulty is to prove that those men, who have swallowed this abominable hypothesis with the greatest relish, are Christians. Prove this, Sir, and you shall be crowned with laurel!

To "remove the whole pretence for assertions" that endless misery is not the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, Mr. R. introduces the testimony of the learned and pious Greek father's of the church. Sir, we can produce the testimony of more ancient men, of greater learning, to prove the meaning of the Greek words! We can produce the testimony of God, and all his holy prophets, to prove the doctrine of "the restitution of all things." Acts. iii. 21. We readily admit, that within 200 years, the predictions of Christ's apostles were verified. Even in the days of the apostles, John (1 Epis. iv. 1.) cautioned those to whom he wrote, saying, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." All "God's holy prophets testify of the restitution of all things." (Acts iii. 21.) There were false prophets in John's time, who denied this truth, and testified that only a part would be restored. Peter says, (2 Epis. ii. 1, 2.) "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." Paul declares in the most emphatic language, (1 Tim iv. 9-11,) "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance. For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe. These things command and teach." It is a lamentable fact, that within 200 years after Christ, "the way of truth" was evil-spoken of." Pretended servants of Christ, sought their own aggrandizement, and incorporated the traditions of men, the absurdities of the heathen nations, with the Gospel of Christ. We agree with Mr. R. "that few indeed but those counted heretics, ever departed from that doctrine" of endless misery. But, Christ and his apostles have been accounted heretics.

Mr. R. also says, "Moreover, both Jews and Heathens in our Saviour's time, generally believed that some men would be eternally punished." True, Sir, the idolatrous Jews, and the stupid Pagans,

are on your side of the question. They were no heretics. They were true disciples and firm believers of the essential articles of your creed.

Mr. R. continues, "The Pharisees were of this opinion, and they were the most numerous and popular sect of the Jews." Yes, Sir, those "serpents," that "generation of vipers," were of your opinion, and harmonized with you in sentiment. We are willing to acknowledge, that the "popular sects, the Pharisees" of every age, are against us. Sir, "our sect is every where spoken against." We never knew a Pharisee to believe the truth. We Sir, will concede at once, that you can produce a host of witnesses against us. But we are satisfied, that "God and all His holy prophets testify of the restitution of all things."

Mr. R. considers that we might expect Christ and his apostles, if the common opinion were false, to abolish the tremendous error, &c. Sir, Christ condemned the doctrine of the Pharisees. He taught that He was the bread of God, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world; all men. (John vi. 33.) His apostles taught the same. Hear Paul declare, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world [all men] unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." Not accounting them guilty. (2 Cor. v. 19.) Sir, Paul, in all his epistles, does not use the word *aionion* but *once*, in connexion with the punishment of sinners. Peter and James have not named it. This word is found (in this connexion) but three times in Matthew's gospel. Luke does not name it. Mark only once. In John's gospel and all his epistles, it is not to be found. In the few passages where it occurs, it is evidently used according to its primary signification, being derived from the root *aion*, age!

Mr. R. refers to Rom. ii. 9-11. Sir, we have a solemn question to ask you, *Do you obey the truth?* Are not you obeying unrighteousness, (giving heed to an unmerciful doctrine,) in opposing the testimony of God, and all his holy prophets? A prophet testifies, (Psa. xcvi.) that "the world shall be established that it shall not be moved." You destroy the world. A prophet declares, (Psa. lxxxvi.) "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." You deny this. God says, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, [Scheol, Hades,] I will be thy destruction." You, Sir, contend, that man will suffer death endlessly. You ask, "What then do they build upon, who thus deny and assert?" We will tell you, Sir, We build upon "Christ, the head of every man." Upon the testimony of God and all his holy prophets. While you build upon "Pharisees, serpents, a generation of vipers!"

(To be continued.)

WHAT IS THE DEVIL?

OR, REMARKS ON DEMONIOLOGY.

Number 34, page 269, contains a communication on Demonology. Before we published this, we promised to give some account of the discussion of

the subject in question, and to state the prominent arguments and testimonies which were produced in the "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth." We also purposed to offer some remarks on the communication, above-mentioned, which have been necessarily deferred unto the present time.

Our correspondent, *ANTI-PYTHONICUS*, assumed the position that "Demons are the spirits of deceased people" (Men.) He has not offered any thing in evidence of the truth of his declaration. Wherefore, as we read of dumb and blind Demons, we are to conclude that the spirits of deceased persons are sometimes blind and dumb. If this be true, they cannot be very mischievous. As our correspondent has given his *own* opinion of the matter, we are not disposed to disturb him, unnecessarily, by an attempt to confute what he has only asserted. Those who consider him as sufficient authority, will be his disciples. The residue will investigate the subject as they please.

In the discussion of this subject, it was proved, that Devils were something new, at a time posterior to the formation of man. The word Devil, (Greek *Diabolos*,) first occurs in Matt. iv. 1. The word *Devils*, first occurs in Levit. xvii. 7. Then in Deut. xxxii. 17. "They sacrificed unto Devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to *new gods that came newly up*, whom your fathers feared not." [The word Devils also occurs in 2 Chron. xi. 15; Psa. cvi. 37.] It appears the fathers of those spoken of, had no fear of Devils. The reason to be assigned is sufficient. They were "*new gods*." There were no Devils to fear; therefore their fathers feared none.

The word Satan, (Hebrew *Sathanas*) occurs first in 1 Chron. xxi. 1. It is conceded that the word rendered Devil, signifies a *calumniator* or accuser. The word rendered Satan, an *adversary*, who is anti, opposed to God, and to man's best interests. The Persian Magi, who were the "Doctors of Divinity" of that day, taught, that two opposite principles or powers ruled the universe, and governed the destinies of men. The good power, who ruled in Heaven, they called *Orasmades*. The evil power, who ruled in hell, *Arimanius*. They taught, that all good and evil was the result of the determinations and operations of these *two* principles or powers. To correct this false theology, it is supposed the declaration by the prophet was addressed to Cyrus, as follows:—"I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: *I the Lord do all these*." (See Isa. xlv. 1-7.) Therefore, *one* power rules the universe, and governs the destinies of men. By *evil*, we understand, not sin in the abstract but, every thing that man considers as evil, because in opposition to what his ignorance pursues as good. The subversion of his plans, the destruction of his operations, and the disappointment of his expectations. Sin and evil are two things. The evil which God produces, has the good of man for its object. The term is adopted because man accounts God's ways to be *unequal*. Sin belongs to man alone. The Devil of the Persians, and of the

more modern "Doctors of Divinity," is a *super-numerary* in creation, a mere scape-goat, to bear away the odium which man justly deserves, and which he is ashamed and unwilling to acknowledge.

Sin is defined to be the "*transgression of the law*." The law of God is God's own rule from which He will never depart. "*Love*," says the inspired writer, "is the fulfilling of the law." From the same source we learn, that "*GOD IS LOVE*." We are also taught, that "he that *hateth* his brother, is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes." (1 John ii. 10.) "God is Love"—God loveth and abideth in light. God's law is fulfilled in and by love. What is sin? Ans. To hate is to sin. To hate is to be in darkness; not to know whither we go. Therefore, to sin, is to miss—to go astray in a wrong path, and not to obtain the object desired. It is to transgress the law, which requires supreme love to God, who is Love; and to love our neighbour as ourselves. (Ask our friends, who account us as the "*offscourings of the earth*," for the author and origin of *their hatred* towards us. What will they answer? "God is Love." His law is lovely. Where shall they go? To their own bosom? Surely, they will not own that they, good people, are under the dominion of their Devil, who they reserve as the exclusive father of those whom they hate. We read, "*The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*." Surely, if this is truth, a Devil is altogether unnecessary. The heart is more deceitful than the Devil, and more wicked. The Devil would be corrupted, and his morals debased, by his intercourse with men possessing such deceitful wicked hearts. If it is desperately wicked to hate, the heart of man is the author of the mischief; the Devil, considered abstractly from man, could not be so guilty. How conclusive! "The heart is deceitful above all things." What! above the Devil? Yes; and more wicked too. Is it not deceitful to calumniate? Is it not wicked to accuse? Is not a Devil a calumniator and accuser? He is. Alas! for our friends, what shall we call them? We must not accuse them wrongfully, nor calumniate them; we must be charitable, and call them "*good people*," with hearts, which civility and charity will not permit us to describe.)

The Devil, let him, or that, be whom, or what it may, is certainly an ugly something to speak of, which crosses the line in a paragraph, and introduces himself, when we are discoursing of our friends, very unseasonably. What is he?

Ans. He is Judas. For Christ says, "I have chosen *you* twelve, and one of *you* is a Devil." (Not one of you looks, or acts like, or serves the Devil.) What is *it*? Ans. *Calumny*; *accusation*. Satan, who is *he*? Ans. Peter. For Christ said unto Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan." What is *it*? Ans. *Opposition*. If you contend for the identity, the personality of the Devil, and Satan, Judas and Peter rise up before you. If you contend for the principle without the association, the

personification, the identity, you speak of calumny, accusation, and opposition in the abstract.

There must be a Devil, because a Devil is spoken of. To speak of nothing, as something, would be absurd. True. There is a Devil. *Who is he?* Christ says, he is one of the twelve *men* whom he had chosen; *Who do you say he is?* Ans. A "fallen angel." How will it read? "I have chosen *you* twelve, and one of *you* is a fallen angel." It reads correctly. The mode of expression is varied, but the sense is preserved. For an *angel* could not fall without becoming a *Devil*. Judas was an *angel*, for all Christ's disciples were *angels*. They were *messengers*. The Greek word *aggelous*, signifies *messengers*; and, although it is frequently translated *angels*, it is rendered *messengers* in James ii. 25. You are right. The *Devil* is a fallen angel. *Judas* was a fallen angel; and Christ says he is a *Devil*. A fallen angel is a *Devil*, for *Judas* is a *Devil*, and *Judas* is a *fallen angel*. How harmonious is truth!

(To be continued.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

BARRE, (VT.) DEC. 16, 1823.

To Br. Hosea Ballou,

Dear Sir—Our venerable and beloved brother, WILLIAM FARWELL, departed this life on the 11th inst. at the house of his son, in this town, in the 74th year of his age. He had enjoyed very good health, for a man of his years, till within two weeks of his death, when he fell on the ice, and about the same time took a violent cold, which terminated his mortal life. He had but just returned from a journey of four months into New-York, New-Hampshire, and through this state, and preached the Sabbath before his confinement, in this vicinity. Br. Farwell remained firm in the belief, "That the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," to the last, and met death with christian fortitude and resignation, giving in the manner of his death, the lie to the old assertion, that a belief in Universal Salvation, may do to live by, but will not do to die by. His wife, with whom he had lived a full half century, survives him, and is happy in the faith of the Gospel.

Br. F. I believe, was the first man who preached the doctrine of impartial love in the north part of Vermont, if not in the state. My object in troubling you with this letter is, that some suitable and respectful notice may be taken of the death of this aged servant of Christ, who has truly "borne the burden and heat of the day."—God, my dear Sir, has provided some better things for us in the present day, than the violent opposition experienced by our fathers in the gospel. The deceased informed me, that in five years after he commenced preaching, he did not receive enough, in all given him, to pay one toll over Connecticut river.

Our brother's character was known to yourself, and for this purpose I have taken the liberty of addressing this letter to you, hoping you will be so good as to make out an obituary notice for the Magazine. I preached his funeral sermon, to a very large concourse of people, from 2 Tim. iv 6, 7,

8. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

"The Truth" is gaining ground very fast in this quarter; the harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few. I am alone in this quarter, almost, there being but one preacher of Universal Grace within more than twenty miles of me.

Accept, respected Sir, my best wishes for your temporal and spiritual welfare. May the Lord still strengthen you to oppose "spiritual wickedness in high places," and prosper your labours in his vineyard. With esteem, your friend,

JOHN E. PALMER.

Selected.

CHRISTMAS HYMN.

JEHOVAH spoke and Gabriel sped,
Upborne on wings of light;
Celestial glory round him spread,
And chang'd to day, the night.

Swift down to earth the Herald flew,
From God's eternal throne;
His shining robe of rainbow hue,
The stars, moon, sun, outshone.

The voice of Love was heard on high,
Loud anthems roll'd around:
Ten thousand angels left the sky,
To chant salvation's sound.

Shout, shout for joy; rejoice, O earth!
Hail, hail auspicious morn!
Rejoice, rejoice, at Jesus' birth,
In him are nations born.

From Zion's hill to worlds above,
Re-echoed back the strain;
And golden harps attun'd to love,
Thus swept Ephratah's plain;—

He comes! the mighty Saviour comes
Good will, peace, joy prevail;
Glad tidings shout: prepare him room:
Hail! glorious Saviour! hail!

Wide o'er the world thy sceptre sway,
Till Nations prostrate fall;
Kings, princes, men, thy law obey,
And crown Thee Lord of ALL.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—2 CHRONICLES XVIII. 22.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o'clock.

¶ An Inquiring Friend, requesting an exposition of Matt. xii. 31, 32, is referred to our Remarks on Mr. Ruffner's Discourse, in this Number.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1824.

NO. 37.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffner, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*"

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(Continued from p. 282.)

In the fifth chapter of Romans, Paul in comparing the effects of Adam's fall with the effects of Christ's redemption uses some expressions supposed to favour the doctrine of Universal salvation. The 18th verse is chiefly relied upon. "For as by the offence of one man judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life."

The context and the uniform tenor of Scripture, lead to this interpretation; Judgment came upon all men *who fell in Adam*, to condemnation; the free gift came upon all men *who believe in Christ*, to justification of life.

We are constrained to this interpretation by unquestionable authority of Scripture.

1. Because justification unto eternal life, is every where limited to penitent believers; especially in the foregoing parts of this Epistle where it is largely treated. Among other expressions we have these, "God sent forth his Son to be a propitiation through faith—that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."* "Being justified by faith we have peace with God through Christ."†

2. Because justification saves from wrath. A few verses before the text in question, Paul had said, "Being now justified, we shall be saved from wrath through Christ." But many will suffer the wrath of God after the day of judgment, as Paul says in this same Epistle. He warns the impenitent that they are treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath; when God will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon all them who do not obey the truth.‡

3. Because the obtaining of faith and justification is limited to the present life, as the Scriptures every where testify. "If ye believe not (says Jesus) that I am Christ, ye shall die in your sins;—and whither I go ye cannot come.§

4. Because in the verse immediately preceding the text, the benefit of redemption is limited to a particular class of characters. "Much more they

which receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by Jesus Christ."

But if the gift of justification have come upon every human being, we must affix such a meaning to justification as to make it consistent with the final condemnation and punishment of the wicked. Accordingly some have understood by it the resurrection to life of the bodies of all men; others have understood by it the means and opportunity of obtaining pardon and eternal life. It is more rational to adopt either of these interpretations, than to make a very doubtful one drive back the whole current of clear scripture.

Another passage in the 8th chapter of Romans is quoted for the same purpose. "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God: for the creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him that subjected it: in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. For the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

The exact import of this passage is doubtful; its general design evidently is to contrast the disorders and miseries of the present world with the glorious state of things to be produced by the resurrection. Paul introduces it by saying that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in the saints. He adds at the conclusion of the passage that not only the whole creation groans, but they also who had the first fruits of the Spirit groaned, waiting for the redemption or resurrection of their body, when all the effects of sin would be done away. Thus we are plainly referred to the resurrection of mankind at the end of the world for the accomplishment of what the passage alludes to.* It cannot therefore mean the universal salvation of mankind; for we have many of the most undoubted assurances of scripture, that, at the resurrection, a part of mankind shall rise to condemnation and be sentenced to everlasting punishment.

The passage is a figurative description of the disorders and miseries to which this lower creation is subjected through the fall of man, and of the glorious change which shall take place at the resurrection, when the wicked shall be banished to another place, the creation re-fashioned for an abode of righteousness, &c. Some think the conversion of the world in the latter days to be intended by the

* Compare the following texts with this passage. 2 Pet. iii. 7-13. Rev. xxi. 3, 7, 8, and xxii. 3. Col. iii. 4. 1 Thess. i. 7-12.

* Rom. iii. 25. † v. i. ‡ ii. 5-8. § John viii. 21-24.

deliverance of the creation into the liberty of the sons of God. At any rate, whoever considers the whole chapter may easily see that universal salvation was not in the apostle's thoughts.

Again; the final salvation of all men is argued from two or three texts which say that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess to Christ, and that this shall be done by all in heaven and earth.*

But Paul very reasonably explains all such texts, by referring their fulfilment to the day of judgment, when every man must confess his deeds and bow to the sentence of the judge. In the 14th chapter of Romans, the apostle quotes the same words, and immediately draws this conclusion, "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God."

Again, Paul says it was the purpose of God "to gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth;" and "through Christ to reconcile them to himself;"†—The meaning is that believers, Jewish and Gentile, saints in heaven and saints on earth, are all united into one harmonious body in Christ; Jew and Gentile, formerly such enemies, are now reconciled to one another, and both to God. This interpretation is most agreeable to the context and to the evident design of the writer in all the passages relative to the same subject.‡ The church is still the subject of discourse; the union and reconciliation of her members in her head, the Redeemer, is still the leading idea. The ungodly, who are without Christ, and reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, are not in the view of those texts at all.

Again, John says that Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil.§ Sin he says is the work of the Devil; by destroying the sins of his people, Christ destroys the works of the Devil. The text does not affirm that the sins of all men shall be destroyed.

Again: "God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth."|| But this text may signify what God wills us to do and has provided suitable means to enable us to do; yet it does not follow, because he has made it our duty to be saved, that none shall be lost, and that instead of *many*, as our Saviour says, *none at all* walk in the broad way to destruction.

I know of but one text more, that is much relied upon to prove universal salvation. It is in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians; that sublime discourse of the resurrection. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, then they that are Christ's at his coming." (Whence we learn that the wicked shall rise last.) "Then is the end, when he shall deliver the kingdom to God the Father¶; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority. For he must reign until he hath put all his enemies

under his feet. Death, the last enemy shall be destroyed."

I confess that, in my mind, this passage does, as much as any in the Bible, banish every lingering hope of universal salvation. Repeatedly and beyond all dispute, the Scriptures declare that the dead shall rise at the end of the world and the day of judgment, and that the righteous shall then be taken to heaven, the wicked consigned to everlasting fire. Then death the last enemy will have been destroyed. He is called the last enemy because the last sufferings of the saints are from him, and their last loss, the loss of the body, is from him. When that loss is gloriously repaired by the resurrection, their last enemy is destroyed. Then also will Christ have put down all his enemies and all their power and authority, by sending them into everlasting punishment. Then (says Paul) is the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. We have express authority for saying that he shall forever reign over his people in heaven.* The kingdom which he will then deliver up is the Mediatorial kingdom—the power which the Father has given him over all things for the benefit of his church. The purposes for which he reigns will then have been fully accomplished (as the text informs us,) by the ruin of all his enemies, and the complete salvation of all his elect. He will then resign the office of Mediator between God and men. Never more will he intercede for sinners—never more will his blood avail for pardon—never more will his power be exercised to deliver the captives of the Devil, nor his Spirit go forth to sanctify:—his gospel—his ministers—his mercy—will be clean gone forever. These are the necessary consequences of the resignation of his kingdom as Mediator. This text accords with the uniform language of scripture, which knows no salvation but that which is begun by sanctification in this life, and is completed at the resurrection. Not one word in the volume of eternal truth points to any other. Thus the last hope of the impenitent sinner dies. The only alternative is, Repent in this world, or bid adieu to heaven, forever and ever.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. Ruffner assured his readers that he would "mention those [passages] chiefly relied upon, and briefly suggest how they are inapplicable or misconstrued." This declaration amounts to slander. The public is given to understand, that Universalists "chiefly rely upon" the few passages which Mr. R. has quoted. Sir, we rely upon the *promises* of God, find them were you can. And we add, we rely upon nothing else. The Scriptures are consistent with God's promises; and we must understand them always in reference to his promises.

Mr. R. first quotes Rom. v. 18. "For as by the offence of one man judgment came upon *all* men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all* men to justification of life." Mr. R. says, "The context and the uniform

* Phil. ii. 9, 10. † Eph. i. 10. Col. i. 20. ‡ Col. i. 18-23. Eph. ii. 11-19. 2 Cor. v. 18-21. and vi. 1. § 1 John iii. 8. || 1 Tim. ii. 4.

¶ εἰς τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδοῖ, κ. λ.

* Rev. xi. 15. Luke i. 33.

tenor of the Scriptures lead to this interpretation; 'Judgment came upon all men *who fell in Adam*, to condemnation; the free gift came upon all men *who believe in Christ*, to justification of life." That is, those who fell in Adam to condemnation, are *damm'd*; those who believe in Christ to justification of life, are justified. This justification is a free gift. Mr. R. talks about the connexion, let us look at it. The 19th verse reads thus—"For as by one man's disobedience *many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of one *shall many* be made righteous." What is the "*free gift*?" Ans. Righteousness. Who receive it? Ans. Those who need it. Who are they? Ans. The *unrighteous*. The *many* who were made sinners; the same *many* *shall* be made righteous. Here is a promise. We believe it will be performed. Mr. R. also says, "Justification unto eternal life, is every where limited to penitent believers." Very good; Sir, if the promise is that *all* shall be justified, as *many* as were made sinners, (and no other can need it), and none can be justified but "penitent believers," then God's promise never can be performed, unless the *many* and the *all* spoken of, become "penitent believers." Now, Sir, the question arises, Whether God justifies men *because* they are "penitent believers," or whether God's justification *makes them* "penitent believers?" The Book reads, "*shall be made righteous*." They do not make themselves righteous. Consequently, there is no condition expressed or implied. Therefore we read in the connexion, Rom. iii. 20-24. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God *which is* by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Sir, all men are justified in the sight of God, in Christ; and men, in this mode of being, are justified in their own minds, when they believe this truth. Thus we read, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, *not imputing their trespasses unto them*." (2 Cor. v. 19.) Paul also declares, (1 Cor. xv. 22.) "For as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ *shall all be made alive*." Mr. R. says, "God will render indignation," &c. "upon all them who do not obey the *truth*." Very true. What is the truth? Ans. "God was in Christ reconciling the world," &c. Men do not believe this. Tribulation, anguish, &c. is the consequence of this unbelief. Men believe falsehood; that God *imputes their trespasses unto them*. According to your hypothesis, Sir, Universalists, only, are unbelievers.

Mr. R. also says, "3. Because the obtaining of faith and justification is limited to the *present* life, as the Scriptures *every where* testify." What!—"Every where?" A bold assertion. To prove it, Mr. R. has quoted the *only* passage which is supposed to teach this doctrine namely—"If ye believe not (says Jesus,) that I am Christ, ye shall die in your

sins;—and whither I go ye cannot come." (John viii. 21-24.) Sir, please to explain; Is it because men *die* in their sins, or because men *cannot come* to Christ, that you infer that justification cannot be obtained only in the *present* life? If it is because we cannot come to Christ, you destroy Christ's *disciples*; for Christ declared to them, (John xiii. 33.) "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and, as I said unto the *Jews*, Whither I go, ye cannot come, so now I say to you." If it is because men die in their *sins*, you destroy *all* men; for Paul says, "Death hath passed upon *all* men, for that *all* have sinned." Sir, unless the Jews die in their sins, they can never be made alive in Christ. Christ saves *sinners*. No man can find life in sinning. James says, (i. 15.) "*Sin*, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*." We tell you, Sir, that you are or have been a sinner. We ask you, whether your sin brought *death* or *life*? If it brought *death*, you died in your sins, and will be eternally dammed if your hypothesis be truth. Thus much for error.

Mr. R. continues—"4. Because in the verse preceding," &c. "the benefit is limited to a *particular* class of characters," &c. Sir, we beseech you, be honest, and let Paul speak the truth. Read the 12th and 18th verses, in connexion, omitting the parenthesis. Then read them with the parenthesis. Can you alter the sense? Paul declares, "Death passed upon *all* men, for that *all* have sinned." Verse 15th. "But *not* as the *offence*, so also is the free gift." Sir, how do they differ? Which exceeds the other? According to your doctrine, the *offence* exceeds. According to Paul, the *free gift*. Paul says, "For if through the offence of one *many* be dead, *much more* the grace of God, and the *gift by grace, which is* by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto [whom? Ans.] *many*." Now, Sir, who are those "which receive abundance of grace?" &c. Let Paul answer. The many who are dead. *Dead!* What! died in their *sins*? Yes. For "all have sinned."

Mr. R. continues—"But if the gift of justification have come upon every human being, we must affix such a meaning to justification as to make it consistent with the final condemnation and punishment of the wicked," &c. Ah, so you have come to this. "We must!" Sir, we must permit God to do as he pleases. Paul says, in reference to God's purpose, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Sir, your "we must," is ill-timed.

Mr. R. proceeds—"Another passage in the 8th chapter of Romans is quoted for the same purpose." Mr. R. quotes, and *alters* the mode of expression, and the punctuation, from the common translation. Sir, why not vary the expression until you arrive at the meaning of the passage? Say, "The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for this *revelation to the sons of God*." The creation (all men) are the offspring of God, and are subjected to a state of *ignorance* of this glorious truth; but are subjected in *hope*. The revelation will be made to them of their relation to God, in Christ the Head of every man, and they will be delivered from their

bondage into the glorious liberty of *children*. (See Heb. ii. 14, 15.) Mr. R. says, "The exact import of this passage is *doubtful*!" That is, to you; and we, therefore, shall doubt your opinion relative to its import. Mr. R. also says, "It cannot, therefore, mean the universal salvation of mankind," &c. Therefore, Wherefore? Because it is *doubtful*! And, strange to relate, "this passage is figurative of the *glorious* change which shall take place at the resurrection, when the wicked shall be banished," &c. That is, it is "*doubtful*!" Sir, when a *part*, perhaps a *large part*, of the creation shall be *banished*, tormented, the *whole creation* will be delivered, &c. We think this is "*doubtful*!" also!

Mr. R. continues—"Again; the final salvation of all men is argued from two or three texts which say that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess to Christ, and that this shall be done by all in heaven and earth." Sir, supposing we were to say, You argue the endless misery of a large part of mankind, from two or three texts, &c. the most prominent of which is the motto to your Discourse; how far should we be from the truth? We repeat, We rely upon the *promises* of God, and them alone. The whole Bible corroborates, illustrates, and explains God's purpose or pleasure, which is good, and has for its ultimate object his glory, which will be manifested by the holiness and happiness of all his offspring. God's *promises* are our evidences that this glorious result shall happen. *We believe God. This is our offence!* Mr. R. adds, "But Paul very reasonably explains all such texts, by referring their fulfilment to the day of judgment, when every man must confess his deeds and bow to the sentence of the judge." Sir, we explain them so likewise. The prophets of old are on our side. (See Psa. xcvi.) "Say among the heathen the Lord reigneth, the *world* also shall be *established* that it shall not be moved; he shall *judge the people righteously*." Again. (Isa. xlv. 22-24.) "*I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, [what? Behold,] In the Lord have I righteousness and strength: to him shall come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed.*" We join with Paul, and say, "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." Paul also declares, (in perfect harmony with the prophet, Rom. xiv. 7-9.) "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living." Therefore, all men live in reference to God's purpose. For Paul also declares, (Rom. viii. 38, 39.) "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." You must recollect the *oath of JEHOVAH* is our evi-

dence that all shall *come to Him*. Also, that Christ declares "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day." (John vi. 44.) Again: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John xiv. 6.) More than this, God declares that *every tongue shall swear: that they have righteousness and strength in the Lord*. You, Sir, consign to endless wretchedness those who have *righteousness and strength*, and this *in the Lord*.

Mr. R. proceeds as follows—"Again: Paul says it was the purpose of God to gather together in one all things in Christ; both which are in heaven and which are on earth, and 'through Christ to reconcile them to himself.'" Mr. R. adds, "The meaning is that *believers*, Jew and Gentile," &c. "*are all united into one harmonious body in Christ*," &c. Sir, Do the words (Ephes. i. 9, 10.) "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, *even in him*," mean that "*believers are all united*," in the present tense? Are you so hardened in iniquity, that you can thus pervert the Scriptures, without blushing? Sir, when we read what God's pleasure and purpose is relative to a *future* period, we dare not say it means the *present*. It is left for you, with all your professions, to make the future *present*, and the present *future*. You add—"The *ungodly*, who are without Christ, and reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, are not in the view of those texts at all." We ask you, How do you know this? Let us "try this spirit whether it is of God." (Rom. v. 6.) "For when we were yet *without strength*, in due time Christ died for the *ungodly*." We have produced testimony, that "every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and *strength*." Sir, are the *godly without strength*? You must answer—The *ungodly*, for whom Christ died, were without strength. How will your declaration appear by the side of these texts? Have the *ungodly* no part not in the matter? You, Sir, and Paul are at issue. We leave you to settle the matter with your own conscience.

Mr. R. continues—"Again, John says, 'that Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil.' (1 John iii. 8.) Sin he says is the work of the Devil; by destroying the sins of his people, Christ destroys the works of the Devil. The text does not affirm that the sins of *all men* shall be destroyed." True, Sir, only "the works of the *Devil* shall be destroyed." Are "the sins of all men the works of the *Devil*?" If you answer, Yes; you admit that the sins of all men shall be destroyed. If you answer, No: you will please to inform, Whose work or works, are the sins of those men which are not to be destroyed? Be cautious, Sir, how you plead the cause of the Devil, exculpate him, and advocate the continuance of his cause and kingdom. You, Sir, would have been an excellent attorney for Saul, had you lived in his day; for Saul was blamed

for not destroying the Amalekites. You could have made it appear, that the order for the destruction of the Amalekites, did not mean that *all* of them should be destroyed! When Christ told the rebellious Jews, "Ye are of *your* father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do," (John viii. 44.) did he speak of the works which were to be destroyed? Sir, sophistry is a thin garment. The sword of truth will pierce through it, and desperately wound the wearer.

Mr. R. continues, "Again; 'God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.' (1 Tim. ii. 4.) But this text may signify what God wills *us* to do and has provided suitable means to enable us to do; yet it does not follow, because he has made it our duty to be saved, that none shall be lost, and that instead of *many*, as our Saviour says, *none at all* walk in the broad way to destruction."—This is pretty well for a Calvinist. Sir, you forget the Institutes of your master, John Calvin. Pray, Sir, answer; Will you hazard the declaration, that God wills the *non-elect* to save themselves, and "has provided suitable means to enable" the *non-elect* to save themselves? What a wretched predicament for a Calvinist! "But this text *may* signify," &c. Mr. R. poor man, did not dare assert any thing relative to the text. Sir, try and conceive it possible for God to will the salvation of those who *need* salvation; those "who walk in the broad way to destruction." Then, Sir, admit the conclusions that result from your own premises, and you will not be far from the truth. No longer assert that the words "God will have, may signify what God wills *us* to do." Answer a simple question—Is it in the power of any man to *save himself*, and to come to the *knowledge* of the truth? You dare not answer this in the affirmative; therefore your commentary on this passage is puerile.

Mr. R. continues—"I know of but *one* text more, that is *much* relied upon to prove Universal Salvation." What! Only *one*? Sir, we can produce a thousand more, not one of which can be disproved by your sophistry. We, Sir, rely upon the *whole testimony* of God, and *all* his holy prophets, for we are assured, that God hath spoken of the *restitution of all things* by the mouth of *all his holy prophets* since the world began. (Acts iii. 21.) If all God's prophets have testified of the restitution of all things *since the world began*, and the Scriptures contain their testimony, it is very strange if only the few passages quoted by Mr. R. contain the whole of their testimony. And we appeal to Mr. R. whether all men ought not to rely upon God's testimony, spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets? Let us hear the "*but one text more*." 1 Cor. xv. 21-26. "For since by man *came* death, by man *came* also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all

rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed, death." Mr. R. says, of this passage, "I confess that, in my mind, this passage does, as much as any in the Bible, banish every lingering hope of universal salvation. Repeatedly and beyond all dispute, the Scriptures declare that the dead shall rise at the end of the world and the day of judgment, and that the righteous shall then be taken to heaven, and the wicked consigned to everlasting fire." We agree with Mr. R. that "this passage does, as much as any in the Bible, banish every *lingering* hope of universal salvation." Yes, Sir, quite as much. For there is nothing in the Bible to banish any hope founded upon the testimony of God's holy prophets. But your "*lingering hope*," *sickly and weak*, nearly dead, is almost banished by the unrighteousness of your own heart. Sir, our hope is not a "*lingering hope*." It is healthy, lively, fed daily and hourly with the refreshing bread of Heaven, and nourished with the water of life, drawn from the Fountain which never fails; none can thirst who quaff the celestial nectar, and drink from the springs of God's salvation. Sir, the conclusion of the above sentence which we have quoted from your 42d page, is nowhere to be found in the Scriptures; although we have *your word* that they declare it repeatedly. We call upon you, Sir, to name the chapter and verse, where it is declared, "*that the dead shall rise at the end of the world and the day of judgment, and that the righteous shall be taken to heaven, the wicked consigned to everlasting fire.*" Sir, until you name the chapters and verses where the above declaration is found repeatedly, &c. a falsehood will lay at your door.

Mr. R.'s ignorance is more fully manifested by the following declaration—"Then death the last enemy will have been destroyed. He is called the last enemy because the last sufferings of the saints are from him, and their last *loss* the *loss* of the *body*, is from him." Paul, what sayest thou? Ans. Paul, "For me to die is *gain*." (Phil. i. 21.) This is upon a par with the generality of Mr. R.'s conclusions. Sir, we will tell you why death is called an *enemy*, and the *last* enemy. Death is called an *enemy*, because his "*sting is sin*." The *last* enemy, because when he is destroyed there will be no *enemy left*. Daniel prophesied of Christ, (ix. 24.) that he should "*finish* the transgression, make an *end* of sins, make *reconciliation* for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness." Shall we anticipate your exposition of this passage? Will you argue that only a *part* of the transgression shall be finished, *some* of the sins brought to an end? &c. This would be necessary, to harmonize with your assertion, "Then also will Christ have put down all his enemies and all their power and authority, [How? Ans.] *by sending them into everlasting punishment.*" This is your account of the matter. But we, Sir, take the testimony of God's holy prophet, who says he will "*finish the transgression—make an end of sins—make reconciliation for iniquity,*" instead of continuing the transgression and sin, in-

terminably, and tormenting the sinner without end. Righteousness shall be brought. Not damnation!

Let "us try this spirit, whether it is of God; because many *false* prophets are gone out into the world;" and we fear Mr. R. is one of them. We have seen the testimony of all God's holy prophets. Mr. R. denies their testimony, and has attempted to palm upon them declarations they never uttered. Mr. R. has declared of Christ's putting down his *enemies*, that it will be "by sending them into everlasting punishment." That is, by tormenting them unmercifully. Now, reader, as you are greatly concerned in this matter, hear what God testifies of himself, and what he requires man to do, to be like his heavenly Father. Luke vi. 32—36. "For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to *them* of whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful, and to the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Does this look like a disposition in Christ to make *his enemies* endlessly miserable? Reader, we say to you, "Be ye therefore merciful, [How much?] as your Father also is merciful." How great is God's mercy? Ans. "He is *kind* to the *unthankful*, and the *evil*." Reader, "Sinners love those that *love them*." And "*sinners* do good to those who do good to *them*." Pause—then answer, Will God, will Christ, do as *sinners* have done? Only love those that love them; and do good to those who do good to them? If so, we ask, in the words of Christ, too, "What thank have ye? for *sinners* also love those that *love them*!" Will God make his enemies endlessly miserable, and never forgive them? If so, reader, the command has gone forth, "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." Make your enemies endlessly miserable, and never forgive them. How abominable is this hypothesis of Mr. R.'s nursing! Sir, you degrade God and Christ to a level with sinners. You make your God to be a mere *publican*. (See Matt. v. 44—48.)

Mr. R., in the attitude of a true disciple of Calvin, (who loved only those whom he thought loved him, and who roasted M. SERVETUS when he considered him his enemy,) declares of Christ, "The *purposes* for which he reigns will then have been fully accomplished, (as the text informs us,) by the *ruin* of all his *enemies*, and the complete salvation of all his *elect*." His friends who have loved him, we suppose. This is the most barefaced assertion we ever read. What! Do you unblushingly assert, that one of the *purposes* for which Christ reigned was the *ruin* of his *enemies*? Hear what God's prophet testifies. (Isa. xlii. 6, 7.) "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to

open the blind eyes, [not damn them for being blind,] *to bring out the prisoners* from the prison, them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." [Not imprison them in an unmerciful *Hell* for ever.] This was the purpose of Christ, and will continue his purpose until it is accomplished. Again: (Psa. lxxii. 11.) "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: *all nations shall serve him*."

Mr. R. continues—"Never more will he intercede for sinners—[Well, if sin is brought to an *end*, and transgression *finished*, intercession will never more be necessary.] never more will his blood avail for pardon—[What! Will it then have lost its *efficacy*? Will the *savour* of it be gone? If so, it will be like the *salt*, which Christ says "*is good for nothing*, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Matt. v. 13.] never more will his power be exercised to deliver the captives of the Devil, nor his spirit go forth to sanctify!—[Why, Sir, if the Devil is *destroyed*, and the prisoners all brought out from the prison, there will be *no* captives to deliver. If all are made holy, there will be none to sanctify.] his gospel—his ministers—his mercy—will be clean gone for ever."

Alas! for this titled disciple of Calvin. How art thou fallen! thou son of darkness! "Who hath bewitched thee?" Surely, the potent word (*aiwvios* *aionios*, "and it is remarkable that this word is in the New Testament applied to a temporal [limited] object but once, and then obviously in a figurative sense. (Philemon 15.)" [Sermon p. 20.] this word is found to fail in another passage, on Mr. R.'s own authority. Sir, how convenient it is, to have an opponent who will confute himself! We read (Rev. xiv. 6, 7.) of "the angel having the *aionion* Gospel to preach to all people," &c. the very *hour* that God's *judgment comes*. At the precise moment when Mr. R. decides that the "*everlasting gospel* will be clean gone for ever," and its ministers with it, and after it, too, we should say, from the mode of expression. A terrible predicament this, for a Master of Arts, and Professor of Languages!!! Sir, your understanding is "clean gone," but we hope not for so long a time as the ministers. We hope you will receive it again. It was cruel in you, Sir, to destroy, or annihilate all the *ministers*, yourself among the number. Where are they all gone? We believe the time is coming, when the ministers of Calvin's gospel, "will be clean gone for ever;" (to follow Christ, and not Calvin,) but Christ's ministers will remain, and rejoice with Christ in seeing the travail of his soul. They will not preach repentance, for all the ends of the world will then have remembered and turned unto the Lord; all the kindreds of the nations will then worship before him. (See Psa. xxii. 27.)

Mr. R.'s declaration, that "the *mercy* of God will be clean gone forever," is an impious assertion. Hear the *true* prophets. (Psa. c. 5.) "The Lord *is good*; his *mercy* is *everlasting*: and his *truth endureth to all generations*." (Micah vii. 18.) "He retaineth *not his anger* for ever, because he *delighteth in mercy*." Is God mutable? Does he delight in mercy *now*; and will the time come when that

which he now delights in will become hateful, so that he will spurn it from him for ever? Sir, your declaration would better become a lunatic, whose senses are disordered. "These," you say, "are the necessary consequences of the resignation of his kingdom as Mediator." Is it so! Does the mercy of God depend upon Christ's exercise of this office? Had God *no mercy* before Christ entered upon the duties of his office? If God's mercy existed *before*, it will continue to exist afterwards. Sir, you make the very *kingdom* to end, which you have so stoutly contended would be *eternal*! We are constrained to say, that this Discourse is made up of contradictions and blunders, almost without a parallel. You contend, first, that the kingdom into which the righteous enter, shall be eternal. The kingdom of Christ. Then you contend that this kingdom shall end for ever. All your criticisms upon the Greek word *aionios* are here destroyed at a blow. The kingdom of Christ, which was to be of the same continuance with the punishment of the wicked, "is clean gone for ever." Sophistry will avail nothing here. Your exposition of Revelation will oblige you to admit that those spoken of in chap. xx. 6, who reign with God and Christ a thousand years, reign in another world, during the continuance of the kingdom of Christ. Therefore, you are obliged to confess, that the judgment commenced with the preaching of the gospel, (Rev. xiv. 6. 7.) at the introduction of Christ's reign and kingdom. That then the righteous enter the kingdom; then the wicked go into the *aionion* punishment. Thus you make the punishment to end with the kingdom or reign of Christ, and the righteous to be transferred to *another* heaven. Therefore, when the gospel and the ministers are clean gone for ever, the word *aionion* is clean gone for ever,—the punishment *ends*! How can they or any reign with Christ a thousand years posterior to the judgment, if Christ's *kingdom ends* when the *judgment commences*? Sir, you make Christ's kingdom to commence and end at the same moment. Your *aionios* is reduced to a mere point. The punishment of the wicked is but for a moment, as it were.

Mr. R.'s assertions to the close of the paragraph, are not supported with so much as one sentence from the Scriptures. To the contrary we read, (1 Cor. xv. 51-53.) "Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; (for the trumpet shall sound) and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal *must* put on immortality." Sir, these declarations are in connexion with the quotation you have so miserably tortured and perverted. Man, in the aggregate, shall rise *immortal* and *incorruptible*, changed from the earthly Adam into the glorious image of the "Head of every man." Your asseverations are but the ebullitions of a bigoted head, and a heart which, we have reason to fear, is yet a stranger to the *mercy* of the God of Love, which *endureth for ever*.

(Concluded in our next.)

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Southold, January 8th, 1824.

Mr. Editor—As our Presbyterian Brethren in this place are in the constant habit of venting their anathemas against the doctrine of Universal salvation, and often wilfully misrepresenting what Universalists believe, thereby doing unto others not as they would have others do unto them, heaping calumny and abuse on those who take the liberty to differ with them in opinion, and who have as good claims to orthodoxy as themselves; consequently going contrary to the example of Christ, who being reviled reviled not again. Perhaps it would not be improper to call upon them through the medium of your valuable Herald, to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. We want them to elucidate the fallacy of this doctrine, and from scripture confute it; but this they carefully avoid; a fair investigation of the subject they shrink from, and only when they enter their pulpits (protected by the civil law from any reply) do they *thunder* their ecclesiastical censure against this damnable heresy. Then it is they cry out, The enemy is coming in like a flood, spreading delusions and false doctrines, and like the adversary of souls going about seeking whom he may devour; lulling people into an awful security, whose final doom must be an endless Hell. All this, for teaching that "*all men will be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.*" That "Christ came to save that which was lost;" and will effect his purpose. That "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the *whole world.*" That "in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and in earth in him." That he "is the Saviour of *all men*, especially of those that believe." That "Christ is the head of *every man.*" That "God was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

Often have I heard them affirm, that the Bible threatened never-ending punishment, and as yet I have never heard them produce any scripture to prove it. Like the ignorant Deacon in the dialogue, they affirm it is so, and that is reason enough. What is still more lamentable, a great many are so great dupes as to believe their bare faced assertions. I again say, I wish them to come out in their might and power, and *confute the doctrine of Universal Salvation*. If they do not, I shall infer from their silence that they are unable to maintain the doctrine they are continually endeavouring to promulgate. It is a fact worthy of remark, that the Presbyterian doctrine is fast sinking to oblivion. God grant that it may be obliterated from this and every part of the world, and that the *glad tidings* of a free salvation, without money or conditions, may be published all over the world, have free course, run and be glorified.

A. G. C.

WHAT IS THE DEVIL?

(Continued from p. 288.)

We read (Heb. ii. 14.) of Christ, "that through death he might destroy *him* that had the power of

death, that is, the *devil*." How does Christ destroy death? Ans. By destroying him that has the power of death. Who, or what is *he*? Ans. The *devil*. But we read, "the wages of *sin* is death." James says, "*sin*, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Then *sin* has the power of death. Therefore Christ came "to save his people from their *sins*." How is this done? Ans. Through death. He bears our iniquities. How? The same as he bore the diseases he cured, as related in Matt. viii. 14-17. "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose and ministered unto them. When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with *his* word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare *our* sicknesses." He bears them away. The *fever* is destroyed. But Christ is not made sick. *Sin* is destroyed. But Christ does not become a sinner.

Diseases, we find, are figuratively spoken of as *demons*. Why so? Ans. Because mankind supposed them to be the effect of a *supernatural* agency or power, operating upon man. The inference necessarily is, that all diseases produced by supernatural or superhuman power, cannot be removed by any power *less* than the power that produced them. Hence the conclusion of the Jews, whose obstinacy prevented their acknowledging Christ to be of God, that his miracles wrought on the diseased were by an *evil* agency, which notion they had received from the surrounding nations, which generally prevailed, and was a prominent feature in the Persian theology.

Christ fought the Jews with their own weapons. That is, he made use of their acknowledgments and opinions, to prove the falsehood of their assertions, relative to him. He obliged them to confess his power to be superhuman. He corrected their mistake, and reproved them for their slander, by informing them that their supposed Beelzebub, or great Devil, could not reasonably be supposed to aid in the destruction of *his own* operations. He told them, that they were of *their father the Devil*, and his lusts (desires) *they* would do. Not Christ. Christ, therefore, reduces the power of the Devil to human. The children and the father are put upon a par. For the *Jews* could perform what the *Devil* desired to have done; but they could not do the miracles which Christ wrought.

We admit that Lexicographers have in compliance with custom, defined the word *demonioui*, rendered devils in Luke viii. 26-33, agreeably to the ancient Pagan notion, which supposes *evil spirits* to exist, who are the enemies of mankind. But they also give the true definition, which is, a *man out of his wits, insane, and beside himself*. For the ignorant Pagan supposed *insanity*, as well as other diseases, to be produced by infernal, or evil agency. Therefore, an *insane* man is called a *demoniac*. But God says, "I create *evil*. I the Lord do all

these." Christ farther magnified his power, and proved that no *devil* had the power he possessed, by transferring the *disease* from the *man* to the *swine*. What! Does God inflict the evil, and Christ remove it? Reader, wait a little. God inflicts the evil, and removes the evil. Christ says, "The *Father* [not the Devil] works, and I work." The evil was introduced to magnify the character of God. Christ corrected the Jews in this very particular, as follows—"And as *Jesus* passed by, he saw a man which was blind from *his* birth. And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work." John ix. 1-4.

In our next Number we shall consider the *serpent* which tempted Eve, and which is supposed to belong to the family of *Devils*. The sequel will prove that mankind have had more *fear* than *knowledge*, relative to this subject; from the Persian down to the modern believers in *Devils, Satans, Lucifers, Beelzebubs, Demons, old Serpents, and old Nicks*.

(To be continued.)

ANOTHER VICTIM

To the doctrine of Endless Torture.

The following is a glowing account of the offering of another victim to Calvin's Moloch. We have no hesitation in declaring, as our opinion, that no person ever enjoyed *peace* of mind, who believed Calvin's cruel hypothesis. To talk of "joy in the Holy Spirit," as the possession of those who believe Calvin's creed, would be a monstrous absurdity. What! Joy in believing the inspirations of a spirit who teaches the *endless* wretchedness of myriads! Call this spirit *holy*! The wretched woman gave melancholy evidence of her sincerity, and the horror inspired by the spirit who deluded her to destruction.

Wiscasset, Jan. 9.

SUICIDE. On Tuesday morning last, the wife of Mr. Humphrey Whidden, of Montville, put an end to her existence. She had, about three months before, joined the Calvinistic Baptist church, in Freedom, and appeared happy in the enjoyment of her faith, till within the last fortnight, when she manifested signs of a *troubled* spirit and *gloomy forebodings*, and has now terminated her wretchedness in death by her own hands. She left two children.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—GEN. II. 7.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at 6 o'clock.

¶ The basement story of the Church erected the past season, on the corner of Prince and Orange streets, by the "Second Society of United Christian Friends," will be opened for worship of the "Saviour of ALL men," to-morrow, at half-past ten o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1824.

NO. 38.

A DISCOURSE

Upon the Duration of FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Ruffaer, A. M. Professor of Languages in Washington College.—Richmond: Printed by N. Pollard. 1823.

THE TEXT.

"*These shall go away into everlasting punishment.*"

MATT. XXV. 46. First clause.

(*Concluded from p. 290.*)

Yet would the sinner fain plead the goodness of God against the denunciations of his word. Truly, God is good. He has written the character of his benevolence upon a thousand of his works. What a beautiful world has he made for us! How has he furnished it with accommodations, necessary, useful, beautiful, sublime! What store of objects to gratify the senses, to delight the fancy, to exercise the understanding, and to excite every pure and noble affection of the heart! How variously beautiful the scenes of nature! Seas, lands, rills purling through shady vallies; plains spreading forth the exuberance of fields and meadows, stocked with verdant plants and sportive animals; hills lifting up their gentle acclivities, mountains veiling their lofty tops with the clouds of heaven.

Then look upwards by night or day. Behold the sun in his glory, the moon with her mild radiance, the hosts of far-twinkling stars. The hand that made all those things, formed us with faculties to enjoy them. But we broke his laws—abused his gifts—and pertinaciously refused him obedience, gratitude, and communion with our hearts. Then our insulted Creator also manifested a Saviour's mercy. The price of our redemption was the gift and crucifixion of God's only begotten Son. He freely gave him up for us all. Law and justice required our destruction: the heavenly Redeemer to open a way of pardon, comes in humiliation, abides in travail and grief, departs in agony and death. Then his heralds sound the joyful proclamation, Grace, mercy and peace from God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ to every penitent believer. But this is the last remedy. He that believeth not, shall be damned. Now salvation may be found. But never more. Such is the substance of the evangelical message. Thus does God manifest infinite goodness and mercy; by making such an offer, at such an expense to such characters. However beautiful this world; yet even in its primitive glory when Eden bloomed, it was but a faint type of heaven. The God of love offers you heaven itself, upon the most gracious terms, as a free, irrevocable gift. But some of you, I fear, have to this day rejected the offer, and preferred

your transgressions to holiness, for your character, heaven for your home, and God for your Father. Perhaps some of you have rejected all these with bitter contempt. God has chosen thus far to display his goodness towards you, and such is the use you have made of the indulgence. Is justice a perfection of the universal Judge? Where then sleeps his justice? When will it awake? How will it exhibit the hatred to consummate wickedness of Him who is thrice Holy? His infinite abhorrence of the most atrocious enormity, the most infernal ingratitude, and the most damnable despite to His bleeding mercy—shall be at last revealed. Oh Sinner, after thy hard and impenitent heart, thou art treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath and the revelation of the righteous judgment of thy God. Hear what he has pledged his veracity to do with you, except you avert it by a timely repentance.

Disease and pain must waste your body, until death closes your eyes upon sun, moon, and stars—upon all the beauties of nature—upon kindred and friends—the endearments of love and the comforts of home:—and you must never know them more. Your spirit must be imprisoned in darkness, till all the generations of men have past away, and you hear from above the trump of God: Impelled by omnipotence, you must return to your grave, resume your body, and open your eyes once more. Think you to behold on earth the calm and beautiful scene upon which you had closed your eyes. Oh, dreadful change! The sun is quenched—the moon is blood—the stars have fallen—flames burst the globe—mountains melt away—thunders peal around the sky—and far beyond it glitters the throne of Christ. The saints are already on his right hand, like a firmament of stars:—to his left, streaming up from the abyss of darkness come the Devil and his angels. You and all like you must join the gloomy throng.—The judge opens his mouth—*Depart*—re-sounds and thrills through the universe. Then what remains for you?—The worm of conscience—the fire of wrath—the blackness of despair—devils—liars—traitors—murderers—blasphemers—rage—terror—remorse—weeping—wailing—and gnashing of teeth. O eternity—eternity!—wilt thou never end?—No—never—never.

REMARKS.

Sir—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." This blustering ill-becomes a sinner, whose salvation is given for God's sake; and not of obligation to you, for your excellence over your despised fellows. Sir, alas! for you, if when you, in mock solemnity, had closed the last sentence of your fulmination, God had entered into judgment

with you, "infernally ingratitude, and the most damnable despite to his bleeding mercy," would have been found at the door of your heart. For, Sir, a prophet says, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." Sir, Nathan will say, "Thou art the man." And we say, "Who art thou, that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand." (Rom. xiv. 4.) We shall try you, Sir, whether you are of God, who is Love; "for many false prophets are gone out into the world." Sir, "Hereby know ye [we] the Spirit of God. [Love.] Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ [anointed Saviour] is come in the flesh is not of God." (1 John iv. 2, 3.) You deny this. You do not confess that an anointed Saviour is come. You speak of a Destroyer, who will come and destroy the offspring of God. You even have the impiety to invoke the name of God to sanction your antichristian doctrine, and accuse him of speaking the words which your own wicked heart and wayward head have devised, and which God hath never spoken. His Son, the Saviour, has declared, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matt. iv. 4.) You have gone to the extremity of opposition to the testimony of God by the mouth of all his holy prophets. God hath sworn by himself, that in Abraham's seed, Christ, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. (Gen. xxii. 16-18.) God has "sworn by himself," saying, "The word has gone forth out of my mouth righteousness, and shall not return; that unto me every tongue shall swear, surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, to him shall come," &c. (Isaiah xlv.)

You, Sir, say, in open defiance of the solemn asseverations of JEHOVAH, guaranteed by his OATH, "Hear what he has pledged his veracity to do with you, except you avert it by a timely repentance." You then relate as the word of God, as "his pledged veracity," that "Your [man's] spirit must be imprisoned in darkness, [How long?] till all the generations of men have passed away, and you hear from above the trump of God. Impelled by Omnipotence, you must return to your grave, resume your body," &c. You declare at this time, "streaming up from the abyss of darkness come the Devil and his angels," &c. Sir, we publicly call upon you to produce this, which you solemnly aver is the "pledged veracity of God," from the Scriptures. If you fail, we call upon all to witness, that you have added unto God's testimony what God has never spoken. Paul, an inspired writer, says the "last enemy shall be destroyed." Also, at the sounding of the trump, "we shall all be changed." He declares of the change, that it shall be to immortality and the heavenly image. (1 Cor. xv.) John declares, (Rev. xi. 15.) at the sounding of the seventh angel, (the last trumpet,) "there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." Not consigned to your devil, and the

catalogue of horrors enumerated by you at the close of your discourse.

Sir, we read, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. viii. 20.) We ask you, Sir, solemnly, as in the presence of God, angels and men, Have you spoken according to the word of God's testimony by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began? The law contains no penalty like that which you have denounced. The testimony says, "All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. All nations shall worship before Him." (Isa. lii. 10. Psa. lxxxvi. 9.) Also, that Christ should destroy the Devil, and deliver the captives. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; [for what men?] yea, for the rebellious also, [for what purpose?] that God the Lord might dwell among them." (Psa. lxxviii. 13.) It is added, (verse 20th), "Our God is the God of salvation." Not of damnation. (See Heb. ii. 14.) You, Sir, "reject the counsel of the Most High," and contradict his testimony! Verily, Sir, as the Lord liveth, thou shalt be held accountable for this thing. Thy way shall be hard, and tribulation and anguish shall be upon you.

Your discourse is characterized by a lamentable obliquity of expression, and unwarrantable asseverations, ill-becoming one who professes to be the servant of the God of truth and love. Take the following, from your 45th page, as one instance of wicked dereliction of the testimony of God. "But this is the last remedy. He that believeth not shall be damned. Now salvation may be found. But never more." You add, "Such is the substance of the evangelical message." What is this, which you have made the last remedy? Ans. The sinner's penitence. Sir, what was the first remedy? In your 44th page, you assert, "The price of our redemption was the gift and crucifixion of God's only begotten Son. He freely gave him up for us all." And, strange to tell, the price is paid, and man is not redeemed. But God's prophet says, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." (Isa. liii. 11.) Please to answer, Did Christ travail for all? Will he be satisfied with a less number than the all for whom he was given? Yea, Sir, including the many who walk in the broad way to destruction? For it is added, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, [How?] for he shall bear their iniquities." (See Matt. viii.) Sir, is not this the first, the last, and the only remedy, contained in God's "evangelical message?"

It is true, "He that believeth not shall be condemned." (Not damned. This is not a Scripture word!) It is also true, that "He that believeth not is condemned already." (John iii. 18.) But, Sir, it is not true, that the condemnation is future, posterior to the present mode of being; and made up of the abominable congregation of epithets which your righteousness has assembled. Sir, we do not ask you to give heed to us, but we command you, by authority of your Master, to give heed to his testimony, and beware how you slight or pervert it.

"This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John iii. 19. Sir, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." Will all men drink the cup of your fury, which you have filled from the exuberance of your love or hatred? Sir, if condemnation, or damnation, (if you prefer this translation,) is the endless wretchedness you have so triumphantly portrayed, you shall drink the cup to the very dregs. For you have been condemned, in common with all the race of Adam.

It is possible some may call this harsh language which we have used in our examination of Mr. R.'s Discourse. We have used "great plainness of speech." Let those who are offended, if there are those, be told, that so long as our conscience is void of offence towards God and towards man, the opinions of men are of as little estimation with us to excite fear, as their applause is, to lure us from what we consider to be the path of duty. We shall endeavour, as we have done, to "declare the whole counsel of God, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear." If they will hear, and they derive benefit from our labours, they are the gainers. If they will not hear, they sustain the loss. We, so far as we "trust in the Lord, shall stand as mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever." We consider Mr. Ruffner in a double sense, as a man, and as a false prophet. The man we touch not. The false prophet we deal with as God's law and testimony directs, unmoved by all the considerations which money, favour, applause, or fear of men or devils can offer. If the reader will accept of this digression, which we have written, not for our excuse, but for his consideration, we will proceed to the conclusion of our remarks.

Mr. R. says, "Yet would the sinner fain plead the goodness of God against the denunciations of his word." Sir, we, sinners as we are, will fain plead God's goodness against the denunciations which you have wickedly attempted to palm upon the public as God's word. But, Sir, we shall not undertake to plead God's goodness against any denunciations of his word. God has not denounced any thing in his word, incompatible with his goodness, which is to all, as well as his tender mercies, which are also over all his works. (Psa. cxlv. 9.) We cheerfully allow you the credit of portraying in true colours the beauty of some of God's works. We respond and say, "Truly, God is good." Farther—"We broke his laws—abused his gifts." Whose laws? Whose gifts? You must answer, Those of a God who is truly good. What will a truly good God do with us sinners? Sir, "we beseech you, by the mercies of God," to receive his testimony. Here it is—"I WILL BE MERCIFUL TO THEIR UNRIGHTEOUSNESS, AND THEIR SINS AND THEIR INIQUITIES WILL I REMEMBER NO MORE." (Heb. viii. 12.) How beautiful the interrogation of a truly "good God's" prophet! "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity?" (Micah vii. 18.) And how honourable to God is the enumeration of his benefits conferred

upon the children of men! "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits. Who forgiveth ALL thine iniquities; who healeth ALL thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies." (Psa. ciii.) What treatment should we expect from this "truly good God?" Reason will join and say, Such treatment as is compatible with goodness! Can we hesitate a moment in deciding what goodness is? No. God's testimony settles the question for ever. To be good, is to be "Kind to the unthankful and the evil." (Luke vi. 27-36.) To be unlike God, and like the sinner, is to love only those who love us. It is to be "without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." (Rom. i. 31.) In fine, Sir, it is to be just like your god!

Note—We have omitted noticing some of Mr. R.'s absurd conclusions, from the considerations, that enough has been said to convince an honest unprejudiced mind, of the wicked folly of the Discourse, and that more might fatigue the reader.

From the Boston Recorder.

UNIVERSALISM RENOUNCED.

Mr. Editor—Having been for several years a believer in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, and having used my influence to propagate this doctrine, I wish now through your valuable paper to make the following communication to the public. I do this under a conviction of duty, and with the earnest hope and prayer, that it may be blessed to the spiritual good of some, who have embraced this error.

From the days of my childhood I have possessed an independent mind, and never could believe or reject any sentiment merely because others did; nor receive any thing upon trust, without supposed evidence. However absurd my childish reasons were, still I must think and judge for myself. The same independence of mind I have ever maintained in forming my religious opinions; nor can any man, who is personally acquainted with me, say I ever blindly and implicitly embraced another man's faith. It is not my object to boast of this independence; but to apprise those, who may read this, that I have adopted my present religious views uninfluenced by any one. And I wish every reader may understand, that I make the following as an honest statement of facts; I now declare what has passed in my mind in the fear of God.

About twelve years ago I was very seriously concerned for the safety and salvation of my soul. I did not however yield to the strivings of the Divine Spirit; but resolved to conceal my serious impressions, and made every effort to efface them from my mind. About this time I heard of the doctrine of Universal Salvation; but living in a retired country town, I had never heard it preached, nor read the writings of any, who advocated it. I thought it must be an excellent doctrine, if true, and was resolved to search my Bible, and see what I could find to support it. And I fear it is too generally embraced, because those who embrace it first wish it true, and then search for evidence by which they may persuade themselves that it is true. As I aux-

iously wished it might be true, I soon found several passages in the Bible, which appeared to me to favour it; the consequence was, all my serious concern vanished away. Perhaps there is no system of religion so directly adapted to banish all serious impressions from the mind, or which does in fact so effectually prevent all serious impressions, as a belief in the system of Universalism. Not long after this I met with Winchester's Dialogues on Universal Restoration; and his reply to the objections he considered against his system appeared so conclusive, that I had few doubts remaining of the truth of his sentiments. Soon after I had opportunities to hear the doctrine preached, and to read other writings in its vindication, by which means I became an avowed Universalist. By continuing to hear and read, my belief was the more strengthened, and I became so positive as not to feel the least doubt of the truth of Universalism; and in this confirmed state without the least concern about the correctness of my belief, without a single doubt that all men would be saved, I continued until the last summer. Twice I have been arrested by sickness, and reduced so low, that I had no expectation of recovery; but my belief was unshaken. This I afterwards considered as evidence, that my faith was correct; but now I can only regard it as evidence of my stupidity. I believed in a *limited* punishment hereafter for all the wicked; but did not consider myself as belonging to that class, stranger as I was to experimental piety. I have often advocated the doctrine of the immediate happiness of all men at death, though I never adopted this opinion *unhesitatingly*; for it appeared too evident to me, that there were some, who deserved a slight punishment hereafter; these however I firmly believed would with all the human family be raised to a state of endless happiness.

A few months ago my attention was, in the kind providence of God, (by means of a question proposed by a pious friend,) directed to my moral condition, and I was led to very serious reflection. My mind was deeply and constantly impressed with the conviction that something more was required of me, than merely to believe in Universalism. I became deeply convinced of my morally ruined state, saw my guilt and depravity, and felt that my heart must be renewed by divine Grace, before I could be happy in any part of the Universe under the government of a holy God. Still I did not renounce my belief in the final restoration of all men to endless happiness. I could not renounce this sentiment which I had so fondly cherished as the sheet anchor of all my hopes, without the most conclusive evidence of its fallacy. But I became fully convinced, that my impenitence and guilt merited endless punishment; and I most earnestly desired and fervently prayed, that I might be led into a knowledge of the truth. I ought here, in justice, to state, that none of my Christian friends, who so earnestly and affectionately entreated me to come to Christ, ever disputed with me about my sentiments, or argued with me to change my belief. But as Universalists often urge others, when favourably disposed to

Universalism, to read and search for themselves, and as I now felt an earnest desire to know the truth, however it might condemn my present opinions, I was induced candidly to review the subject, and examine the evidence on both sides; and was thus led, as I humbly hope, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, to discover and embrace, and love the truth, as it is in Jesus. And I am constrained under a conviction of duty to declare my decided belief, that the punishment of all who die in their sins will be endless.

I am also fully convinced of the entire depravity of the human heart, and of the exceeding sinfulness and unlimited demerit of sin, and however plausible and pleasing the opposite sentiments, which I have so fondly embraced, may appear to the unsanctified heart, I am constrained cordially to renounce them.

It is often said by Universalists, that the opposers of their system, have never examined it; that they do not know what it is, and condemn it too hastily. But this cannot in truth be said of me. I have firmly believed it more than *seven years*, and have read most that has been published in this country in support of Universalism. It cannot then be my ignorance of the doctrine, which has induced me to reject it. I have renounced it after a faithful and candid examination of all its principles, and feel sacredly bound to declare that *I believe it to be a false doctrine, of the most fatal tendency.*

It would occupy too much time, and perhaps be entirely useless to those, who are settled down in the confident belief of Universalism, to detail the reasons, which induce me to believe this system so erroneous and dangerous; and if they be as confident in error as I once was, it will be as vain to attempt to convince them by argument, as it would have been to have convinced me by reason or scripture. I know they will all see their error sooner or later; and it is my earnest prayer, that they may see it before it be too late.

Those who *hope* the system of Universalism is true, but are not without doubt, I would most earnestly intreat to pause and consider; and not conclude, that this system may be true, because they wish it true. I have given the system a fair trial; I have firmly believed it, and strenuously advocated it; and I now feel an unwavering conviction that he who builds his hopes for eternity upon this system, builds his house upon the sand; and that he will not be able to die in peace, unless he dies in *stupidity*. I have been acquainted with all the arguments, and the entire train of false reasoning, which Universalists employ to maintain their favourite theory; but have been constrained by the light of evidence and truth to abandon the whole.

While I believed in Universalism I was earnestly engaged to win others to the same belief, and when I had opportunity, never failed to engage in argument with those who opposed it. I have also distributed many Universalist Sermons and Magazines, and done what I could to advance the cause of Universalism.

My desire and prayer by this communication is, to counteract, if possible, in some measure, the influ-

ence I have exerted in favour of error, and to bear my feeble testimony to the truth, as it is in Jesus. I would advise all very faithfully to examine their own hearts, while forming their religious sentiments and attempting to decide what is truth. Let them see that their hearts are right with God, and prepared to love the truth, and then they will not be likely to embrace false doctrine. The arguments employed by Universalists, and the passages of Scripture they disconnectedly quote, may appear very plausible and conclusive to those, who are in an unsanctified state; but I beseech you, *trust them not*; for they will not stand the test of the last day.

I am aware how this honest statement will be regarded by Universalists; for I know how I should once have regarded such a statement myself. The Universalists do not believe in the entire sinfulness of the human heart, nor in the unlimited demerit of sin; and consequently are not expected to embrace the other great doctrines of the Gospel. It is my earnest desire that none of them may continue to reject the truth, as long as I have. I would assure them, and all who may read this, that it is no fiction, and no misrepresentation; but a simple statement of my own case; and if questioned, I am ready to testify to its truth. That it may be savingly blessed to those, who maintain the errors, I am constrained to renounce, and prevent others from embracing the same errors, and promote the cause of truth and righteousness, is the humble desire and fervent prayer of

A LATE UNIVERSALIST.

[The object of the preceding statement is not to provoke controversy, or unnecessarily wound the feelings of any one, but to counteract the influence of error, and promote the cause of truth and righteousness. If any should question its authenticity, because the writer has not affixed his name, it is left with the Editor, and may be known at his office.

Ed. Rec.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

PROVIDENCE, January 5, 1824.

To the Editors of the Magazine.

Brethren,—I send you enclosed, a communication which was written for the RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCER, a paper published in this town, edited by a BAPTIST MINISTER; and which has been denied by the Editor, a place in his columns, without explaining to me or the public, any reasons why it was rejected. I therefore submit the communication to your inspection, and anticipate its appearance in the Magazine, should you think the arguments and remarks which it contains might prove of any service to the public.

Yours in the FAITH of ABRAHAM,

A RHODE-ISLAND UNIVERSALIST.

REPLY TO A LATE UNIVERSALIST.

Mr. Editor,—In looking over your paper of the 26th ultimo, my attention was attracted by a communication taken "FROM THE BOSTON RECORDER," and headed "UNIVERSALISM RENOUNCED."

As your paper professes to be established upon principles that are *impartial*, I confidently antici-

pate that this calm and friendly reply will find an early place in the columns of the *Intelligencer*.

This writer informs us that he had been a *firm believer in Universal Salvation for more than seven years*, and then renounced the belief from a conviction that it was *false doctrine*.

He apprizes us that the prelude to his conviction was a *question proposed by a pious friend*, which induced him to some reflection upon his *moral condition*.

There appears to be something mysterious in this statement! Nor can I discover how it is possible for a man to expect salvation for himself, without being sensible that he is a *sinner*, and that he stands in absolute need of the interposing hand of Divine grace to effect his deliverance, and to replenish his soul with peace.—Without this, or a similar reflection, no man can become an Universalist. I have no doubt that a man may become a *deist* without such moral reflections; but it is certain, that without them, he can never be an Universalist. This statement, therefore, upon the very face of it, bears some of the prominent indications of fraud: and I should not be surprised to find that the author of the communication which is the subject of these remarks, was really a *Deist*, during the seven years which he mentions. The public are already aware that the most groundless and detestable falsehoods have been reported, and currently circulated through the medium of *Religious Newspapers*, of Universalists renouncing the doctrine of impartial grace; and that many of these falsehoods have been detected, and with their authors, held up to public view as objects of merited contempt.

The case before us, however, may be different.—There is a conceivable possibility of a man who has been an Universalist, having lost the evidences of his faith, so far as to embrace the doctrine of endless suffering in a future state.

Now what does all this prove? Nothing more than that this man's belief of a future state is different now from what it once was. It does not prove that his present views are correct; or, that his former sentiments were false. One thing, however, is certain; if the communication under consideration, be not "a pious fraud," the author of that communication must now entertain less exalted views of the power, benevolence, and grace of God than he once did; consequently must esteem that grace in the same descending ratio, as its efficiency in the work of salvation has diminished in his understanding.

This communication, it seems, affords a momentary triumph to the believers of endless misery; has given additional interest to a recent conference, and elicited a new burst of eloquence!

But why should the renunciation of Universalism by a solitary individual produce such an excitement, or give rise to so much exultation among the believers of limited grace? The most consistent answer which reason and experience can furnish, is, the extreme novelty of the case! And for want of similar occurrences, even the ashes of the dead have been disturbed, and they have been made to speak

a language on the eve of their departure to the world of spirits which never found a place among the number of their thoughts in the land of the living.

After all, I do not find it in my heart to attach any great share of blame to those brethren who exult in this renunciation of Universalism, (*provided it be real*) for it is quite probable they will not be furnished for years to come with a similar occurrence, to excite such evident demonstrations of joy.

I cannot in justice dismiss this nominal renunciation, without calling the reader's attention to what this writer calls the *truth*, and which he informs us he has been brought to *embrace and love*. These are his words, "I am constrained under a conviction of duty to declare my decided belief, that the punishment of all who die in their sins will be endless.—I am also fully convinced of the entire depravity of the human heart, and the exceeding sinfulness and unlimited demerit of sin." Here we are furnished with the sum of his new creed, with which he would have us believe his heart is in love! The first article which it contains, asserts the *endless punishment of sinners*. I can easily admit that he really believes the sinner will be endlessly miserable; but how can I be persuaded that he *loves* this *supposed* truth? I cannot possibly give credit to his assertion, without either dismissing from my heart every charitable sentiment concerning his character and feelings, or being furnished with satisfactory proof that he is a confirmed maniac! No man ever loved a truth in which he could not rejoice. And for a man to assert that he is in love with, or that he can rejoice in anticipation of the endless suffering of a fellow-being, takes upon himself a character which can never be designated by any epithet in the catalogue of names, except it be that of a *demon incarnate*! The very language of this assertion, if it be not the incoherent ravings of a disordered intellect, is proof positive of a deep-rooted malignity to the beings of our race, or the most stubborn unreconciliation to the revealed will of God! For "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. ii. 4.

Nor does the second article of this *new creed*, evince a greater degree of sanity, or consistency, than the first. This embraces the sentiment of *total depravity*.—Now if a being be totally destitute of any moral ability to do good, where is the justice of condemning, or punishing him for the non-performance of good deeds?—Nothing could be more arbitrary, cruel, or unjust, than to punish a man for not doing an act, for the performance of which he possessed no proper ability.

In order to admit the doctrine of *total depravity*, we are forced to deny the existence of sin! For the power, or ability to do good, is the power to do evil: and whenever this power to do a good action is misapproved, or misapplied, it renders its possessor a transgressor—and yet a man, according to this writer, must be endlessly miserable for doing, or not doing what he had no ability to perform!! Such a tissue of absurdity is surely enough to make a

reasonable man blush. The third article of this new creed, caps the climax of his inconsistency. In this he supposes sin to be of *infinite or unlimited demerit*. What is sin? St. Paul answers, "Sin is the transgression of the law." Now I ask, is the transgression of the law an act of the creature man? Again; Is the creature man, an infinite, or finite being? Finite, most certainly. How then can an infinite act proceed from a finite being? a being limited in all his powers! Or how can an infinite effect result from a finite cause? The reader will see that these questions can never be answered in a way to give the least countenance to the hypothesis we are considering.

Again,—If sin be an infinite evil, can the sinner ever add to the sum of his guilt, after the commission of one offence, by the perpetration of a thousand crimes? To increase the guilt of a being who is infinitely criminal, is utterly impossible. On supposition, therefore, that sin is an infinite evil, the man who has committed one offence, may sin with impunity all the rest of his life; for there cannot be the least danger of adding to his criminality or his punishment—for *one* sin, according to this sentiment, would merit an infinite punishment, and a *million* could merit no more!! If this doctrine, namely—the doctrine of infinite sin, be not demoralizing in its influence upon the mind, by encouraging the repetition of sin, I know of no doctrine that would be dangerous to the morals of society!

Reader, I wish to ask you one plain question—Can you believe the writer of the *renunciation* sincere, (provided his intellects are not disordered) when he tells you that *total depravity, infinite sin, and endless misery*, are truths which he loves? Extend, dear reader, I beseech you, the balcony wing of pity, and pray that he may be restored to his right mind, and to the love and practice of the truth as it is revealed in the gospel of Christ.

As the renunciation of Universalism by a solitary individual, is eagerly embraced by many, as a proof that the doctrine is false, I am inclined to favor the advocates of endless misery with a few examples of similar proof in relation to the doctrine which I profess.

The following are the names of a few of the Universalist Clergymen, who were formerly believers in the doctrine of Endless Misery, and have RENOUNCED that sentiment:

Zephaniah Lathe,	formerly a Baptist,	
Thomas Gross,	do.	Congregationalist.
Nehemiah Dodge,	do.	Baptist.
Mr. Funk,	do.	Lutheran.
Hollis Sampson,	do.	Congregationalist.
J. S. Thompson,	do.	Methodist.
Benjamin, Hicox,	do.	do.
Zelotes Fuller,	do.	do.
Eliphalet Case,	do.	do.
Hosea Ballou,	do.	Baptist.
Adin Ballou,	do.	do.
David Ballou,	do.	do.
Abner Kneeland,	do.	do.
Walter Balfour,	do.	do.
J. E. Palmer	do.	do.

A. Kinsman,	do.	do.
Seth Jones,	do.	do.
Mr. Crossman,	do.	do.
Mr. Underwood,	do.	do.
Jacob Frieze,	do.	do.
Asahel Davis,	do.	Episcopalian.
Thomas Jones,	do.	Methodist.
Edw. Mitchell,	do.	do.
Thomas F. King,	do.	do.
Ezra Leonard,	do.	Congregationalist.

The Gentlemen whose names are here given, are still living, and can answer for themselves, if called on. Thousands of examples of a similar nature might be produced from among the living, and many of the pious dead, who we trust, are gone to realize what their faith so ardently embraced, might be added to the number—But I forbear. The venerable names of many Universalists in this town, who have been believers in the popular creeds, will long be cherished in the remembrance of a grateful people, as worthy examples of christian faith and moral rectitude.

Yours, most sincerely,

A RHODE-ISLAND UNIVERSALIST.

NOTE.—The author of the piece alluded to in the foregoing "Reply," is known to have stated *after he pretended to renounce Universalism*, that he did not believe in the doctrine of endless misery, but that he believed all men would finally be saved! Thus, if his own declarations are to be credited, he at one and the same time, both held to Universalism and renounced it! He is an apt scholar in the study of Orthodoxy, for he has already learned the language of inconsistency and contradiction.

Edit. U. Mag.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Gen. iii. 22. "Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil." Here the Lord made use of the word *us*, when speaking of himself.

Gen. iv. 16, 17. "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife."

Where did Cain get his wife; as Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, were all that were living at that time? Your remarks on the above, will much oblige

A SUBSCRIBER.

Rochester, (N. Y.) Dec. 21, 1823.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent's first query, relative to God's speaking of himself in the plural number, cannot, of itself, amount to any thing, as proof of a plurality of persons or existences in God. For (if we do not mistake,) the Scriptures represent God as speaking of himself, and using the personal pronoun "I," in the singular number, *one hundred and eighty times*. If these modes of expression are to be introduced as evidence, there are about *one hundred and eighty* witnesses on one side of the question, and only *two or three* on the other. Surely, "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety."

The second query, "Where did Cain get his wife?" Is easily answered. But, before we answer our correspondent, we shall state as a preliminary,

that if he refuses to admit the evidence we produce, he shall prove to the contrary of our premises and conclusions. In plain English. We shall name the *very place*, where Cain married his wife. If our correspondent disputes the truth of our evidence, let him inform us where Cain's wife was found and obtained.

We learn (Gen. ii. 8.) that "God planted a garden (a green place, or Paradise) eastward in Eden." Eden, then, is the place, or location of the garden. When the man sinned, "God drove out the man." The man was then in Eden, but not in the garden, the green place. Cain, after his transgression, went out from Eden, "and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden." The same as to go out from New-York, and dwell in Connecticut. Cain obtained his wife in Eden. But our correspondent's great difficulty is, to find a wife *anywhere* for Cain, unless he marries him to his mother, who, he supposes, was at that time the only woman in the world. This is a sad mistake. Eve was the mother of a blooming family, as we learn from the genealogical account of Adam's posterity, in Gen. v., the order of the arrangement of which, has nothing to do with the time of Cain's marriage. We are told of Adam, that "he lived nine hundred and thirty years." That "he begat sons and daughters." There is no mystery here. Cain married his wife in Eden. We regret that we cannot state with precision her age, complexion, and the names of all who were at the wedding.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Hudson, 12th month 28th, 1823.

Friend Fitz—As I am a constant reader of the Gospel Herald, and well remember the religious controversy that took place between thee and William Dean of Dutchess county, some time since, I thought an account of his happy exit, might be gratifying not only to the Editor, but to the readers of the Gospel Herald. His life corresponded with his belief, that "immortality" could only be obtained "by a patient continuance in well doing; seeking for (spiritual) glory, honour, and immortality," as Paul said. Whether his belief was true or not, if it would cause people to live as he lived, *happy and godly*, doing good to all, I would to God that the whole world believed it; then, they would die as he died, feeling "the power and the wisdom of God," to clothe his soul with perfect peace and joy. "The religion (said he) that I have lived by, I now find will do to die by." His religion brought him to the possession of solid and substantial virtue.

"Virtue sole survives—immortal, never-failing friend of man, his guide to bliss on high."

Pilgrim Stranger.

P. S. My brethren, the Society of Friends, excommunicated friend Dean for altering one article of his faith as above. Is it right, according to Scripture, to excommunicate a brother or sister, on the account of differing in opinion? P. STRANGER.

REMARKS.

It is gratifying to us to learn, that Friend William

Dean's exit from this transitory state was composed and consolatory. It could not be a *happy* one. For we should do violence to his character for *benevolence*, were we to declare that he cherished no desire for the future glory of *all* his brethren of the human family. Happiness consists in the possession of numerous desires, whose conceptions are followed by full fruition. Friend Dean's desire for *all* men's glory, wanted the one thing needful—*faith in the promises*. The foundation of true happiness is laid; which, according to Paul, is *Jesus Christ*. Friend Dean's comparatively good life, might afford him hope for *himself*; according to his peculiar principles of education. But, for us, living or dying, we can never be happy short of the glorious assurance that *all* our brethren shall participate in the "life and immortality which is brought to light by the Gospel," and secured, *for all*, by the promises of a faithful and unchangeable God. The arms of *our mercy* are extended to the very borders and outskirts of creation. Our God "is able to do exceeding abundantly *above* all that we can ask or think;" to whom, and to whom alone, be ascribed unceasing glory, dominion, wisdom and power, throughout all ages—Amen!

Note—We believe it to be our duty, and the duty of all men, to imitate the "long suffering" of God, and to bear with *one another* so long as God bears with *us*. It is our opinion, that we shall not err by following the example of Christ. He associated with *sinners*. He was *without sin*. How absurd then, for *sinners* to refuse the company of *sinners*, because they are jealous of their *holiness*! For ourselves, we should *smile*, at a bull of excommunication, however dignified the *sinner* who vented it.

ORTHODOX SLANDER.

The following, first published in the *Mirror*, is copied from the *Boston Recorder*, a publication devoted to the interests of men who "*make merchandise*" of souls. This attempt "cunningly to devise fables," and mislead the mind of the public relative to the principles of their religious opponents, is dishonest, dishonourable, and wicked. Universalists are the only people we know, who contend that there is a *hell* for *all* sinners, from which there is no escape. They decare in the impressive language of the prophet (Psa. ix. 17.) "*The wicked shall be turned into Hell*; all the nations that forget God." Who are those, who teach, that the wicked, if they repent, shall *not* be turned into Hell? Who teach, that the *non-elect* only shall be turned into Hell? That the *elect*, however wicked they may be, however they may forget God, shall be saved from Hell, and go unpunished? If these *Hell-preachers* believed the *wicked would* be turned into Hell, we think they would bridle their tongues some times.

"*Heaven and Hell*.—If we are to believe there is no such place as hell, we must believe also, that there is no such place as heaven. Heaven most certainly is not precisely such a place as the clouds, or sky; nor is hell such a place precisely as a dark, terrible, bottomless pit, or a lake of fire. Heaven actually exists, and God describes it by comparing

it to the sky, the noblest object which all men see. After the same manner he describes hell, by comparing it to the grave, a pit, outer darkness, &c. But if heaven far exceeds in glory the skies which we behold, let the careless sinner tremble while he considers what hell must be, to represent which the most gloomy and dreadful of all natural objects are utterly inadequate."

Mirror.

REQUEST.

As we are desirous of making out a Biographical Sketch of our late esteemed Brother ELHANAN WINCHESTER, we earnestly solicit from our friends, particularly from those in Philadelphia, New-York, and Hartford, all the information which they can give us of him, of the events of his life, of his religious labours and successes. Whatever be the information of this kind, which our friends possess or will procure for us, it would be most gratefully received by *The Editors of the Magazine*.

"THE GAZETTEER."

We are happy to observe that Br. KNEELAND has recommenced his publication. It is entitled "*The Gazetteer*." The following are the conditions of the work: Each number of the *Gazetteer* will contain eight large quarto pages, on fine white paper and handsome type. It will be published every Wednesday evening throughout the year, at Three Dollars per annum, payable half yearly in advance. At the end of the volume, a handsome title page and table of contents will be added, without any additional charge to the subscribers.

NOTICES.

The Basement story of the New Church, corner of Prince and Orange streets, will in future be opened for worship of the "God of the whole earth," every Sabbath, at half-past ten in the morning; half-past two in the afternoon; and at half-past six o'clock in the evening. It will be opened every Thursday evening, at seven o'clock, when it is expected our Br. Mitchell will officiate. Our Br. King is expected to preach to-morrow.

Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the *Gospel Herald*, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to JAMES HALL, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—GEN. II. 7.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half past 6 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1824.

NO. 39.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

To the Editor—Sir, I feel myself bound by the Sacred writings, to disbelieve your doctrine of unconditional salvation. Were those promises of salvation which you generally select from the Sacred Volume, viz: Ephesians ii. 8, 9, 10. 2 Tim. i. 9–10. Titus iii. 5. Rom. xi. 6. Acts iv. 12. 1 John v. 10, 11. Ephes. i. 3, &c. 1 Cor. xv. 22. 42, 43, 44. Hebrews viii. 10, 11, 12. Luke iii. 6. Psal. xxii. 27. and Psal. lxxxvi. 9. I say, were those promises unconditionally made to all mankind, then would I joyfully embrace your plan of finished salvation. But I find the Sacred penman solemnly and pointedly declare they are not. I could wish, with all my heart, Sir, that your doctrine were, and if so, that I firmly believed it; then should I be delivered from many painful and distressing fears about my eternal all, lest I should be so unfaithful as to miss of heaven at last. For I find that the sacred writings declare the promise of salvation in an hereafter state, to none but the "faithful until death." "Be thou faithful until death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "He that shall endure to the end, the same shall be saved." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord! shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven." From these three passages of Holy Writ, Sir, it is evident, that none will be saved in an hereafter state, but the doers of God's holy will faithfully until death. Well, Sir, if none but the faithful doers of God's will until death, can be saved, what will become of all the unfaithful doers not of his will until death? I think, Sir, that the truth of God will constrain you to answer, in the language of scripture, and say, that the unfaithful doers not of God's will until death, "Shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." "The smoke of whose torments ascendeth up for ever and ever."

Now, dear Sir, if you can prove from, or by the sacred writings, that all the unfaithful doers not of God's will until death, will be saved, as well as the faithful doers until the end, or death: Or if you can prove, by Divine authority, that all will be faithful doers of God's holy will until death, then I shall believe that all mankind will be saved after death.

Holy writ binds me to believe that God desires the endless salvation of all, and that he hath power in himself, as in store, sufficient to save all, and had he not circumscribed his power by his immutable word, from saving all the unfaithful doers not of his will until death, I should believe with you, that

all will be endlessly saved. But as this circumscription of God's power is abundantly and evidently declared in the sacred writings, therefore I cannot believe all will be saved, unless you can give me convincing proof, from Divine authority, that all will be faithful doers of God's will until death; or prove that he will save the unfaithful, &c.

It is plain and evident, from the holy Scriptures, as well as from reason and the nature of things, that God hath commanded his creature man, a work of obedience to do, as a condition (*not merit*) relative to man's salvation, and if man will perform this work, faithfully until death, God hath promised to save man. But, if man will not obey God; if man lives in disobedience to his divine commands until death, God hath declared that man shall be damned; by which declaration he circumscribes his power, his immutable word, from saving all the disobedient until death. In reference to which, I will only quote one passage of holy writ. "He that believeth and is baptized, the same shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned;" that is, taking this passage and the one before mentioned, viz: "Be thou faithful until death, and I will give thee a crown of life," together, and then they imply, that he that believeth and is baptized, and continueth faithful until death, the same shall be saved, and he that believeth not, and continueth unfaithful until death, shall be damned. By which we may see that God delegates power to his creature man, as a free agent, to circumscribe or uncircumscribe the power of God before death, in a day of probation, relative to the endless destruction, or salvation of the soul of man. The believer may hinder God's power from saving him, by becoming an unbeliever; and the unbeliever may uncircumscribe God's power to the salvation of his soul, by becoming a believer before death. But, remember that belief implies the doing of all the works of obedience that God requires; for all beliefs that do not produce works of obedience to God, are dead beliefs, and cannot profit nor save, saith the Scriptures, James ii. 14. 17. 20. 24. 26. I conclude by subscribing myself your

INQUIRING FRIEND.

REMARKS.

Our correspondent is entitled to our thanks for his candour. We are mutually interested in the inquiry which is the subject of the communication. With a view, therefore, to an undisguised expression of our sentiments, a faithful exhibition of testimony, and an honest estimate of argument, we shall be plain and pointed, trusting that our correspondent is a man of too much candour and good sense to take offence when none is intended.

Our correspondent, who, for the sake of brevity, we shall call a friend, "feels himself bound by the sacred writings to disbelieve our doctrine of *unconditional* salvation." He refers to a number of passages, and says, "Were these promises *unconditionally* made to *all* mankind, then I would joyfully embrace your plan of *finished* salvation. But I find the Sacred penman solemnly and pointedly declare that they are *not*." Sir, you have indirectly admitted that these promises are "unconditionally made" to a *part*, or *some* of mankind. You have not assigned any reason, nor produced any Scripture to authorize this *partiality*. Neither have you produced the "solemn and pointed declarations that the promises are *not* to *all*," which you aver are contained in the Scriptures. You, therefore, are very deficient in these particulars.

You also confess, that your present faith is *painful and distressing*. This proves you to be an *unbeliever* of God's promises. An apostle says, "We who have believed do enter into *rest*." God's promises, therefore, cannot be believed, without producing rest. Again; we read, "Receive the end of your faith, the *salvation of souls*." How many? As many as God's promises, which are the object of your faith, include. But you, Sir, what have you received? What have you found to be the end of your faith? Ans. Not the salvation of *souls*, nor even of your *own* soul; but "*painful and distressing fears*." Sir, you are of the number of those spoken of, who "wrest the Scriptures to their *own* destruction." Here is cause and consequence. You do not believe God's promises of mercy are to and for all mankind, without money, and without price; therefore, you have "*painful and distressing fears*." Alas! for you, Sir, your "*broken cistern* can hold *no* water." You have "*committed two evils*." First, You have forsaken God, a *Fountain* of living water. Second, You have substituted in the stead of this inexhaustible Fountain, a *little broken cistern* of your *own* hewing. Sir, your fears are proper and authorized. With you, it is all *I*, "*lest I should be so unfaithful*." Are God's promises predicated upon your faithfulness? If your broken cistern leaks, is that an evidence that God's Fountain is empty? Sir, you must awake—rouse yourself—open your eyes. But this is Christ's office. Will you do the Saviour's work? Can you "*open the blind eyes*? Bring out the prisoners from the prison; them that sit in darkness out of the prison house?" In a word, Can you make your cistern *tight*? Are God's promises conditional, that your cistern shall *hold* water?

You, Sir, say, "I find that the sacred writings declare the promise of salvation in an *hereafter state*, to none but the *faithful* until death." This a broad assertion; let us examine it. You have referred to twelve passages, in your first paragraph. We ask, Do these passages declare that the promises contained in them are *limited* to "*the faithful until death*?" No. Sir, it is sufficient to say, that when you examine Ephes. i. you will discover that Paul predicated his hopes of salvation on the fact that he was "*predestinated according to the purpose* of him

who worketh *all* things [not a part,] after the *counsel of his own will*." You will learn what God's *purpose* and *will* is, by consulting the 9th and 10th verses of this chapter; and 1 Tim. ii. 4.

It is true, that we read, "Be thou *faithful* until death, and I will give you a crown of life." But, Sir, we nowhere read, "If you are *not* faithful until death, I will make you endlessly miserable." Men are exhorted to steadfastness, are encouraged by assurances of good. Your quotation, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be *saved*;" refers exclusively to the destruction of Jerusalem; and the salvation, a deliverance from the siege; as the connexion abundantly proves. Sir, we believe and teach, that those only "*enter the kingdom of heaven*," who do the *will* of God. You may learn what his will is, by referring to the passages above mentioned. You ask, "What will become of the *unfaithful* doers of God's will?" Who are they? We read, (Jere. iv. 22.) "*For my people* [yes, my people,] *is foolish, they have not known me*; they are *sottish children*, and they have *none understanding*: they are wise to *do evil*, but to *do good* they have *no knowledge*." What will you do with these sottish children? They have no knowledge. They are unjust and wicked. Damn them for ever. That will not make them *wise*, nor *good*. Save them. How? This is the question. Read this—"By his *knowledge* shall my righteous servant *justify many*, for he shall bear their iniquities." (Bear them away.) Sir, you labour under a great mistake. You consider that the *wise* and *good* only will be saved. Alas! for the *ignorant* and the *evil*, who need salvation, if you are correct. Alas! for God's people. It is the *unjust* whom Christ shall justify. He came, "*not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance*." He says, "*The whole* need not a physician, but those that are *sick*." Sir, the *unfaithful* shall be made *faithful*. The *sick* shall be made *whole*.

You, Sir, *wish*, with all your heart, that our doctrine were true, and that you believed it, for then you would be *delivered* from painful and distressing fears. Well, we read, "*The truth* shall make you *free*." But, alas! for you, Sir, you do not believe the truth, and slavery is the consequence. You confess that you are bound to believe that *God desires* the salvation of *all*. Sir, God will not be disappointed. Christ will "*see of the travail of his soul* and be *satisfied*." If Christ desires what God desires, and what you wish, all will be well. Sir, Christ has given evidence of love and benevolence greater than *yours*. It will require as much to satisfy him, as to satiate your wishes.

Sir, we tell you, that you, on your own confession, are an "*unfaithful* doer of God's will." You are punished with destruction from his presence, which is life, and from the glory of his power, which is salvation. Whether it will be *age-lasting*, as was the case with the unbelieving Jews, God only knows.

In reply to your second paragraph, we declare, that the *unfaithful* are not saved as the faithful are saved. You are an evidence of this. You are troubled. You prefer *darkness*, uncertainty, to *light*, or

certainty. You are condemned *already*. All are not faithful doers, &c. until death. But, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord." Read Ezek. xxxvii. You believe that *future* glory depends upon *man's present* performances. We say, "For other *foundation* can no man lay than *that is laid*, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Corinthians iii. 11.) Is our foundation good? It is Jesus Christ. When he is satisfied in the quantum of human happiness, we shall be. "*We know him, and the power of his resurrection,*" &c. We ask no more.

In your third paragraph you assert your belief that God has power sufficient to save *all*. Strange to relate, you then add, "Had he not *circumscribed* his power, by his immutable word from saving *all*," &c. "I should believe with you, that all will be endlessly saved." Can it be possible that God's word limits his power? Can God be almighty, if his word asserts the contrary? Can his word assert the contrary, if he is almighty in power? Sir, we have *your* word for this; not *God's* word. In your last paragraph you declare that man, the unbeliever, or the believer, to use your mode of expression, can "*uncircumscribe, or circumscribe* God's power," &c. Sir, this may be the case with your God; but the true God says, "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." (Isa. xli. 10.) We also read, "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doth according to *his will* [not man's] in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and *none can stay his hand*, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. vi. 35.) It would be superfluous to adduce more testimony to disprove your hypothesis.

You assert in your last paragraph, that man must do so and so, &c. as a *condition*, &c. You declare this to be plain and evident from reason and Scripture, as well as the nature of things. You quote one passage to prove this, with *your* addition that the salvation is in an *hereafter* state. Namely, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." This you associate with your former quotation, "Be thou faithful," &c. Sir, you take things for granted. You prove nothing. Now we deny that any man ever was or ever will be *damned*; according to your conjecture. You add, "Remember, that *belief* implies the doing of *all the works of obedience*." We do not remember this. We remember this—"By *grace* are ye saved, through *faith*, and that not of *yourselves*, it is the gift of God. *Not of works*, lest any man should boast." (Ephes. ii. 8, 9.) Sir, we entreat you to read your Bible with attention, and to remember that the English word *damnation*, which has a terrific and appalling definition, and the original word rendered *damnation*, are *two*. The unbeliever, Sir, is *condemned*, [is unjust in the sight of God,] and so are *all* men, as Paul abundantly proves, Rom. iii. But man is saved from condemnation by the *faith of Christ*. Strange as it may appear to you, Sir, "God hath concluded *all* in *unbelief*, [condemnation;] that he might have *mercy upon all*." (Rom. xi.) Speaking after the manner of men, "we have

sorrow in our heart," for this unbelief. But we rejoice, that, however great may be the present grievousness, there will be an exceeding great glory for all.

THE SECRET OUT!

We invite our readers to the perusal of the following piece taken from an orthodox print. Here is a picture of the Hindoo priesthood, drawn by an Englishman, which will equally apply to the "stalled theology" of his own country.

If the English, who own the country, are foiled in their missionary exertions, by what miserable infatuation are the Americans induced to persevere?

Plain Truth.

FROM THE BOSTON RECORDER.

DIFFICULTIES OF CHRISTIANIZING THE HINDOOS.

From Mr. Perowne, Missionary, to the London Church Missionary Society.

The more clever of the Hindoos are very fond of discussing metaphysical questions. There is much subtlety in their reasoning; and, as they argue from premises which are either false or cannot be proved to be true, of course their conclusions are of no value. The Brahmins are very fond of asking questions of this nature: "Whence comes evil?" "Why did God give Satan the power of sinning?" "How do you account for dreams?" "Is not all spirit *ONE*?" "Where was the soul of man previous to his birth?" and a thousand such questions. A Missionary is often compelled to enter on the discussion of subjects of this nature, though in so doing, he must feel that he is off his proper ground. I say *COMPELLED*; for, if he refuses to give an answer, they conclude that he is unable, and treat him with *SCORN, AND REFUSE TO HEAR HIM*. Such unprofitable and vain discussions should always be avoided, where it is possible; and the same subject should never be entered upon a second time with the same person. It is the object of *SATAN* to prevent our preaching the Saviour, and it should be ours, to preach or converse about nothing else.

It is, however, sometimes necessary to enter on the question, "Whence comes evil?"—*DIFFICULT AS IT IS*: for it is the great misery of this people, that while they give themselves up to every species of crime, they charge the whole with *SHOCKING BLASPHEMY, UPON GOD*! If a man commits any sin, he blames his fate; and in effect tells you, that he was compelled to act as he did. They believe that the actions, whether good or evil, of every man, with all the events of his life, *ARE ORDAINED* of God, and written invisibly in every individual's forehead, soon after his birth: hence the custom of preparing pen, ink, &c. in the room, on the first or second evening after the child is born: hence too, the word "*copal*," forehead, is used for destiny or fate. In a word, by confounding moral and natural evil, they make God the author of both; thus destroying at once all human responsibility. It will easily be conceived, how difficult it is, under such circumstances, to convince a man of sin. Had not the Saviour promised an Almighty

energy for this purpose, I should SIT DOWN IN DESPAIR.

From principles so false and corrupt as those of the Hindoos, you will easily conceive that no good fruits can be produced. Indeed, it is scarcely possible for a person in England to form an adequate idea of the moral degradation every where evident in this country. Such is the depravity in which the people are sunk, that it is almost impossible not to exercise wrong feelings towards them. Patience is absolutely necessary for a missionary in India. Here we have need to bear with an unruffled temper, and almost without seeming to feel, the most glaring falsehoods, the most foolish and childish assertions and reasoning, the most unjust conduct, and the most blasphemous expressions; for, if you manifest but such ZEAL AND WARMTH as are perfectly consistent with Christian feelings and principles, they immediately accuse you of BEING ANGRY, and tauntingly tell you, that Christians, so far from betraying anger, ought, when SMITTEN ON ONE CHEEK, TO TURN THE OTHER.

While, however, from the insensibility and immoral conduct of the Natives, the mind of the European is likely to be filled with disgust, their ignorance and servility, on the other hand, tend to engender a feeling of SUPERIORITY very unbecoming the Christian character. Humility, patience, and love, joined to perseverance and faith, are what all missionaries, especially those intended for India, should particularly pray for.

As my acquaintance with the natives enlarges, I am increasingly convinced that THERE IS SCARCELY ONE WHO HAS THE LEAST PRETENSION TO ANY RELIGIOUS CONCERN. If you propose anything to a man, his first question is, "What shall I get?" or "What will be the advantage?" The very PRIESTS have no real concern about their religion. Their objects are MERELY MERCENARY; and they officiate at the temples because they cannot get an easier or more lucrative situation. The following incident will illustrate this observation. In taking a walk one evening, I stopped at a temple. At first, the officiating Brahmin seemed unwilling to converse. At length, however, he laid aside his reserve, and we entered into conversation. Pointing to an image that stood before me, I asked, "What is that?" He replied, "It is God." I expressed my astonishment that he should have such unworthy notions of the Deity, as to suppose Him a piece of stone; or that he should be ignorant enough to think that image capable of affording him deliverance or salvation. "You know," I continued, "that it is only stone, and cannot help itself: why do you thus dishonour God and deceive the ignorant people?" He rejoined, "Sir, what can I do? I have no other means of getting a living. For my service at this temple, I receive of the people of the village various articles of food, &c. amounting to about four rupees a month." "I perceive," said I, "that your god is your belly:" he fully assented, observing, "Yes; if you will give me five rupees a month, I

will do as you wish." Such indeed is the mercenary character of the natives, that they confess without hesitation, the irresistible power of money over them. They unblushingly assert, "We can do any thing for money—nothing without it." These are the words, not of the most abandoned characters, but of some of the most respectable among the sacred caste!

WHAT IS THE DEVIL?

(Concluded from p. 296.)

Agreeably to promise we now consider the *Serpent* which tempted Eve. When a serpent is spoken of, the mind at once conceives of a *snake*, as being a party concerned. But we are told, the *Devil* entered a serpent or snake—appeared to Eve in the form and guise of a beautiful serpent or snake, and charmed her into acquiescence. That is, men tell us this. Dr. Clarke, however, supposes the animal might have been an *ourang outang*; a species of *monkey*! According to this conjecture, when our Saviour called the Pharisees "*serpents*," we are to understand that they were *monkeys*! So much for *learned* conjectures.

What is a *Serpent*? Ans. If *Pharisees are serpents*, a *serpent is a Pharisee*. Did a Pharisee tempt Eve? Yes. How? In the same manner that he tempts you, reader. How is that? We will tell you. "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of *his own lust* [desire] and enticed." (James i. 14.) A *man's own lust*, or desire, is the *Serpent*. A *man's own desire*, is born of the *flesh*. We read, "That which is born of the *flesh is flesh*; that which is born of the *spirit is spirit*." Therefore, the desires of the *flesh* are in opposition to the *spirit*. A Pharisee has no enmity to the *flesh*, the serpent; and therefore is characterized as a serpent. But God says, "I will [in the future tense,] *put enmity* between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." (Gen. iii. 15.) The woman *loved the serpent*, the *flesh*, and obeyed its dictates, in opposition to the *spirit*. She "was drawn away of her *own lust*, and enticed."

Reader, this is the very serpent that beguiled Eve. He is still beguiling her posterity. But God will put *enmity* between the woman and the serpent, and between her seed and his seed. The serpent bruises the heel, the enmity bruises the serpent's head. In the person of Jesus Christ, the enmity shone conspicuous. He had no love for the serpent. His enmity was such, that he pursued him to the death; and we are assured, that through death he will *destroy him*, the serpent, who has the power of death, and deliver them who are in bondage. (See Heb. ii.) In bondage to whom? Ans. The serpent. "For if ye live after the *flesh*, [the serpent,] ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit [the enmity] do mortify the deeds of the body, [the serpent] ye shall live." (Rom. viii. 13.) The Jews were of this faith, this *flesh*, this serpent, and his desires, their *own* lusts they would do. Their heel was bruised as a consequence. Alas! for those who want a worse serpent or devil, than this Old Serpent, who be-

guiled Eve. Who are contriving plans to kill another devil, and permit this mischievous Old Serpent to pester and torment them with impunity.

The following is a copy of the objections brought by those who contended for the existence of another devil, whose existence and operations are independent of man, and of man's agency, with the brief answers to them.

OBJECTION.

If Christ was tempted as mankind at large are tempted, that is, "*enticed by his own lust*," and not tempted by a devil externally and personally, then he *coveted* and was a *sinner*.

ANSWER.

Paul says, Christ was "*tempted in all points, like as we are, and yet without sin*." Query—Does Paul speak the *truth*? If he does, must it not be conceded that Christ was enticed by the lust of his *own* body, the same as other men? And when this is conceded, which must be done, or Paul's declaration be flatly denied, does it not follow, of necessity, that the declaration that Christ was a *sinner, if thus* tempted, is *false*? Therefore, the matter at issue is between those who bring the above objection, and Paul!

Again. James says, "*Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed*."

OBJECTION.

A man cannot be "*drawn away of his own lust and enticed*," without *sinning*.

ANSWER.

James says, "*Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death*." The lust must go through a process called *conception*, before *sin* is produced; the *sin* must be *finished*, not *thought of*, before it can produce *death*. *Thinking* is the *enticing*. The *mind* must *conceive a purpose*, which the *man* receives with *approbation*, before the *sin is finished*, and becomes a sin, to be amenable to God's law, which inflicts *death as a penalty*.

OBJECTION.

Mankind are tempted from *two sources*—that is, the origin of sin in the mind of man is *two-fold*.

ANSWER.

This is a *modern* discovery—James knew of but only *one* source of temptation, or *one* origin of sin, in the mind of man: Namely—"his *own lust*;" for James says, "*Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed*."

We offer the above premises and their conclusions not only to those present, but to the *world*, and pledge ourselves to maintain and defend them, against all arguments that may be brought to confute them.

The objection, that Christ could not be tempted without becoming a *sinner*, is answered by Peter, 2d Epistle, ii. 9. "*The Lord knoweth how* [whether you know or not,] to deliver the godly *out of temptations*." James i. 2. says, "*My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing, that the trying of your faith worketh patience*." Should we say, count it all joy when ye

fall into divers *sins*? If Christ could not "*be tempted, in all points*, like as we are, and yet *without sin*," this construction would be inevitable.

Reader, beware how you *love the serpent* that Eve loved. Keep *this* devil under, and you will do well. Fare thee well.

Note. James ii. 19, was introduced. "*Thou believest there is one God, thou doest well; the devils also believe and tremble*." As if James had said, Thou believest there is one God, so far you are right, but what of this? Even *demons, men out of their wits, insane and beside themselves*, believe this.

From the (Bost.) Universalist Magazine.

A WONDERFUL REVIVAL OF RELIGION.

One of the most wonderful revivals of religion, of which we have an account, either in ancient or modern times, we find narrated in the 3d chapter of Daniel.

It is true that men of small power, with little minds, and limited means, and with motives consistent with desires the most contemptible, have even in our day, been able to creep into houses, and, as the apostle says, "*lead away silly women*" after them, whose husbands have, in some instances, been found to be as silly as they; and collecting a few to meet and spend nearly whole nights in making a noise, and neglecting their children, and living upon their neighbours, have been able to make out something of a report of what they have called a "*Revival of Religion*." But the account given in the 3d of Daniel is of a far superior character. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, one of the most powerful monarchs on earth, was wonderfully wrought upon; and he formed the resolution of becoming, in more than ordinary degree, religious. To do this, in a style which became his royal dignity, it was necessary to give the subject an air of splendour, which should not fail to render it popular. At an immense expense, therefore, he made an image of gold, not less than ninety feet in height, nor less than nine in diameter. This lofty idol was raised on the plain of Dura, in order to accommodate the multitude who were to become its worshippers. That the populace might the more easily be induced to pay their homage to this idol of gold, all the great men in the nation were first enlisted in favour of the king's purposes. To this end the king sent to gather the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to assist at the splendid solemnities of the dedication of his idol. They all arrive, from their different countries and provinces, and appear before the image. A herald now cries the order of his majesty, which informed the vast assembly of different nations and languages, that when they should hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sacbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, they should then prostrate themselves and worship the golden image.

What a solemn sight this must have been! Who could doubt the sincerity of their devotion? That

it was truly sincere we may be fully certified by duly regarding the awful sanction by which the worship was enjoined. There was a furnace prepared and kept hot, ready to consume the impious wretch who should not fall down and worship this wonderful idol. Without this furnace the whole scheme would have been a mere farce, or solemn mockery; but the terrors of the furnace, the sight of its vivid flames, enkindled in the hearts of the people the genuine enthusiasm of sincere devotion. So effectual were the means which were used for the promotion of religion in these times, and on this occasion, that we have an account of only three unyielding hearts, who did not experience its efficacy and power.

Perhaps some may doubt the genuineness of this religion, and of this wonderful revival; but be that as it may, there never was, in ancient times, a more perfect representation of modern orthodoxy. The king's idol was of *gold*; that was the best metal he could obtain. Orthodoxy presents us a god of the very finest materials that clerical wisdom, and clerical chemistry can produce. Nebuchadnezzar had a furnace kept hot to render devotion fervent and sincere. Our clergy would have one if they had the power which the king had. But notwithstanding their weakness, they have done better than one would have calculated; they have *imagined* a fiery furnace in the invisible world, which they contend their god keeps hot, always ready to receive such as refuse to worship him in this world. This, *besure*, does not succeed so well as Nebuchadnezzar's scheme did; but it comes as near perfection as their limited power can approximate. Nebuchadnezzar, our clergy, and all the world bear testimony that neither the old idol on the plain of Dura, or the modern moloch, has the least merit in himself, or that any person of common sense would ever have worshipped them, if it had not been for the furnaces which have been the terror of both ancient and modern worshippers. And this will appear evident, if we recollect that the three, who did not worship the golden image, were not terrified at the furnace. And this is the case with many in our day. They have no fear of the furnace, which the clergy threaten them with, and therefore they will not worship their idol; they pay no adoration to any god, but to him alone whose attributes are free from revenge, and who is too good to need a system of terror to compel people to adore him.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—As I have for some time heard much debating on the subject of religion; and as it appears to me there is not that importance attached to the character of Christ, which is given to it in the Scriptures; and reading that Paul counted all things as loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ; and believing that Christ is the way, and the only way of salvation; I have made free to send you the following, as my sentiments on that subject; and to request you to point out in what part you differ from me, or what portion you consider as erroneous.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good;" is the advice of "Paul the servant of Christ." Reason teaches us, that the sayings of God must be true. We are commanded by Christ when we pray, to say, "Our Father which art in heaven." Christ again speaks of himself and says, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." You will observe, that Christ while on earth, here speaks of himself as being in heaven, consequently he declares himself to be the Father. Again, Christ says, "I and my Father are one," not two, or three. The declaration is positive, that Christ is the Creator of all things. The humanity, or human body, he veiled his glories in, that he might manifest himself to the world he made; and dwelling in that body, he was Immanuel or God with us; and that body or blood being a part of the human family, he being the Creator, and consequently Father of all, mankind are, wonderful to relate, his brethren; he the head, they the other members. And he the head rendered perfect obedience to his law, in their stead and for them, that his righteousness might be theirs, and he as the "head of every man," died for every man, and "destroyed death and him that had the power of death," and rose from the dead, which resurrection was the destruction of death; for he "led captivity captive," or led death, the gaoler, who until that time kept mankind prisoners in the grave, a captive. And mankind, agreeably to the declaration of Paul, have "risen with him," a spiritual resurrection to eternal life in the Son of God, "who is the same to-day, yesterday, and for ever." This can be proved expressly from the Scriptures, beyond the possibility of refutation. "Herein is love, not that we love him, but that he first loved us." Unto the *one only true and living God, the eternal Father*, who clothed himself in our flesh, and reconciled us to himself by his body, as our elder brother, on the cross, and who will, in his own good time, purify us by the operation of his holy Spirit, and write his law upon our heart, be ascribed all the honour and glory, dominion, and power, for ever. Amen.

In the words of Paul, we are determined to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified." Any other name, or way of salvation, dignify it with what appellation you please, whether election, good works, baptism, keeping the law, or any other name or way, which human ingenuity, fear, or pride, may invent, we shall consider as mere *rubbish*. "A man is a Christian in proportion as he trusts in Christ alone for salvation," to the exclusion of every thing else which can possibly be imagined or named under heaven.

Your compliance with the above request will oblige
ASPASIO.

REPLY.

Our correspondent, Aspasio, wishes us "to point out in what part we differ from him, or what portion we consider erroneous," &c. It is presumed that at no time since the commencement of the Christian era, has a greater diversity of opinion existed relative to Christ. Indeed, it may be assert-

ed, that the opinions of the different religious sects, of Christ, are the most prominent features of their Creeds, Confessions of Faith, &c. For, as Christ is the express *image* of God, no consistent views of God can be cherished by any religious sect, when God is considered abstractly, and not in this divine *relation*. Therefore, some contend there is no other God than Christ. This sentiment was fully expressed by the celebrated Dr. Watts, as follows—

—“God the mighty Maker died,
For man, the creature's sins.”

Others contend that God dwelt in Christ; that is, His Spirit, without measure, producing an unity of conception and action, and that Jesus Christ is the *Son* of God. And there are yet others, who assert that Jesus Christ was the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary. It would, perhaps, be difficult to delineate, in an acceptable manner, the various and peculiar features of the prevailing Creeds of the day. We shall therefore, for the present, confine ourselves to the task of expressing our understanding of the character of Christ, comprising his being &c. in the *relation* of existences according to our conceptions. We use this mode of expression, being every day strengthened in our conviction, that all profitable and correct ideas of Theology, must have a reference to all *subsisting relations*. For instance, it would be unprofitable to reason of God, as of a Being having *no relation* whatever; because God, however independent he may be, considered abstractly, is now essentially connected of His own will and purpose, in all the relations which exist in conformity to His will and purpose. Is Christ the *Son* of God? Then we must consider God in the relation of *Father*. Is God the *Father*? Then we must consider Christ in the relation of *Son*. Is *man*, in the aggregate, the *offspring* of God? Then we must consider God in the relation of Author, Creator, Producer, or Cause. For man is authorized, created, produced, or caused. God, therefore, must be considered in relation to Jesus Christ, His Son, and to man, His offspring. Jesus Christ must be considered in relation to God, the Father, and to man, being a partaker of his blood; and, in reference to his office and work, as Mediator between God and man. And man must be considered, in the relation to Christ, the *Mediator*, and to God, the Creator. God, also, must be considered in all references to the relations which exist. Christ must also be so considered; and man likewise. God as Author. Christ communicator. Man the receiver. God's relation is descending. Christ's ascending and descending; and man's ascending, through the Mediator, unto an union with God's perfections, to complete his happiness; which, man's happiness, is the end and aim of all subsisting relations, which are compatible with the most *superlative glory* of God.

It would require a volume to treat the subject, as we have stated the relations which subsist, between God and man, through the Mediator, and the relations of the Mediator. Suffice it, therefore, to say, that the Mediator must be always, and every way considered in the relation of Mediator, in confer-

mity to God's *original purpose*, and not in the relation of a *contingency* to produce a different result than was first intended, or which was endangered, or made liable to frustration, by the happening of any possible event. That is, all subsequent relations, are in accordance with God's eternal unchangeable purpose. Whether we consider Christ the Mediator, or man the recipient, or the causes which produced the existing relation of things and principles. If it be possible we will be more explicit. God's law, spiritual and ceremonial; the order of all events, comprising the nature and consequences of the events; the formation of man, the state of vanity to which man is subjected; the Mediator's office and work; the chastisements of God; the effect of chastisement, to improve the understanding of the chastised; with all possible subsistences, whether of principles or things; are in conformity to God's character and purposes, and all with LOVE. Love formed man. Love chastises man. Love redeems man. Therefore, the Mediator, Jesus Christ, came to subserve the purposes of eternal love, the Author of all, and not to make love of hatred, or to change the being, character, or purpose of God. “GOD IS LOVE.” Every sentiment in opposition to this momentous truth, is a cloud which intercepts the light of truth, and darkens the understanding.

Is God *wrathful* and *angry*? Then he was always so, and will ever remain so. Then wrath and anger created man, preserves man, redeems man, and ensures his happiness. What are *passions*, but ebullitions of the moment? Man has passions. Man is operated upon, as the elements of which he is composed, are susceptible of impression from a variety of causes. But God is a *cause*. Effects cannot operate on a *cause*. O, that men understood this! that they would consider that “GOD IS LOVE.” That love is always love; and hatred, its opposite, always hatred. We adopt the language of Paul, and say, “therefore hath he [in the present tense] mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that answereth against God?” We repeat, that “GOD IS LOVE.” You can find no cause to answer against God. You cannot resist his will. If you understand his will, you will not be disposed to fear or doubt. You will say, “Father, thy will be done.”

When we speak of the *being* of Christ, we mean the *relation* of his existence with the Author, the Cause. For all being is existence of some kind. What is God? Ans. “Love.” What is God? Ans. “A Spirit.” What is God? Ans. “A consuming Fire.” Love—Spirit—Fire—are three modes of expression, or names, by which we conceive of God's existence. Of Love, we are told that “it is stronger than death.” Of Spirit, that it “is immortal, and dwelleth in light inaccessible,” for it is God. Of Fire, that it “will purify.” The Son is the “express image of” this, God's *hypostasis*, or substance, but not the *hypostasis* or substance. The *relation* subsisting is the same as the image is to the original. In this sense, Christ says, “I and my

Father are one." For his image is of the Father, and of no other being or existence in creation. What is the original, the Father? Ans. *Love—Spirit—Fire.* The Son is the express image of *Love—Spirit—Fire.* An "express image" is a likeness of the person or thing it is the image of. The least dissimilarity in essentials, lessens or destroys the expression.

First. Consider Christ's *love.* The evidence he gave of his love was the strongest, the greatest we can conceive. He died for his *enemies*; and expired invoking *blessings* on their heads. Second. Consider Christ's *Spirit.* The Spirit was given to him without measure. How was it manifested? Let Christ speak—Luke iv. 18, 19. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Third. Consider Christ's *Fire.* It was spoken of him by the prophet, that "he is like a refiner's fire." There exists then, the most intimate possible relation. An "express image." What is this image called? Ans. The "*Son of God.*" The "*only begotten.*" Jesus Christ is the only express image of God. No other is begotten. This, then, is the *being* of Christ.

The character of Christ. That is, every thing by which he is characterized. Well, he is the "express image" of the Father's substance. The Father is considered as the *Cause.* Christ is the image of the Cause. Read his love, meekness, gentleness, forbearance, longsuffering, mercy, and truth. It cannot be written. The mind can better conceive it. Words are not the image of Christ. We must possess his spirit, feel the fire of his love, before we can conceive of its intenseness, its glory, its goodness.

Thus far, we have considered God and Christ, in their relation. We will now consider Christ in relation to man, as Mediator, and always the express image of the Father. Is the Father wrath? So is the Son. Is the Father angry? The Son is also incensed. Is the Father unpropitious; does he require a sacrifice to appease his vengeance? The Son requires the same. He came to do the Father's will. They are *one* in purpose—one in feeling—of one Spirit—and that is LOVE. Would to heaven that mankind would be consistent sometimes, and acknowledge, that the *vicar* of the sacrifice is not the express image of the wrathful judge.* The "wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness of men," &c. The Son has the same wrath. Every man who is led by the spirit, has the same wrath. The enmity to the Serpent, sin, will become universal. Christ was born of a woman. Paul says, "It behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." (Heb. ii. 17.) Also "He is not ashamed to call them brethren." (ii. 11.) But, how great his pre-eminence over his brethren! He is the "express image of God." He "is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. He is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all he might have the pre-eminence." There is no man in his senses, who will pretend that the man Christ Jesus was born before Cain, and Abel, and Seth. Or, that any pre-eminence can be awarded to any one on account of primogeniture in this sense. Christ's pre-eminence, as the *first-born*, consists in the manner of the birth, as well as the order of it.

The Father has constituted him the "*Resurrection and the life.*" Paul, (1 Cor. xv.) predicates every thing relative to man's salvation, upon the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead. We do the same. We contend that the relation which exists between God and Christ, Christ the Mediator and man, ensures the resurrection of man to life and immortality. Therefore, "we preach Christ crucified." But this is foolishness to some, and to others a stumbling block. When we learn the relation of the Mediator to man, man to the Mediator, and all to God, and God to all, we rejoice in the harmony of God's purposes, and admire the wisdom of their accomplishment. Destroy this relation, and the temple is no longer fitly framed together. The mind wanders amidst disjointed and broken parts, void of all symmetry, and destitute of all relation.

Truth is simple to him that understandeth. But, simple as it is, the blind eyes cannot see it. This relation which we have considered, as subsisting in an intimate union between God and Christ, must be perfected in God's own time, and in harmony with all his purposes. Christ has illustrated this relation in a clear and emphatic manner, in John xvii. 20, 21. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." We rejoice, that Christ, as Mediator, will reconcile all unto God. Draw all, by the Spirit of God, into a divine union, according to the relation of man, as the offspring, and of God, as the great Father of man. When man shall be *one in God and Christ* as God is in Christ. When LOVE shall be universal, reigning in every heart, and be the governing principle in all created intelligences. This is the consummation to which we look. We adore the great Jehovah as the Author of all good. Ask of him; agreeably to his will, all good, in the name of Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant. And, in faith, anticipate the glorious era, when all shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

☞ The Basement Story of the Church, erected by the Second Society of United Christian Friends, on the corner of Prince and Orange-streets, will be opened for worship of "the God of the whole earth," every Sabbath; at half-past ten in the morning, half-past two in the afternoon, and at half-past six o'clock in the evening. Also, every Thursday evening, at seven o'clock, when it is expected our Brother Mitchell will officiate.

☞ Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

* * * We are requested to mention, that our Br. King is expected to preach at Rahway (N. J.) on Tuesday evening next, weather permitting, &c.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—GEN. II. 7.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half past 6 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL

HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

* Some represent the Son to be all love and mercy, and the Father all wrath and vengeance. There is no image nor likeness here.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1824.

NO. 40.

UNIVERSALISM RENOUNCED.

A few months since it was stated that Elias Smith, who it appears had publicly advocated the doctrine of the salvation of all men, had renounced his faith. The following from Mr. S. will furnish the reader with means of judging. For ourselves, we acknowledge that we are at a loss to understand Mr. S. when he says, "From various causes, *separate* from the *Scriptures*, (about six months ago,) I gave up the doctrine as *doubtful*, and endeavoured to preach a limited salvation; but never preached *endless misery*; a doctrine not named in the Bible." Are we to understand, that other evidence, than the *Scriptures*, was admitted, and the *Scriptures* set aside, as insufficient?

From the (Bost.) Universalist Magazine.

GENERAL CONCLUSION,

OR THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets; and have hope towards God, which they themselves allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust."

Acts xxiv. 14, 15.

In almost every age of the world, it has been the lot of public men, to suffer by evil report and good; to be considered as deceivers, and yet true. This Paul well knew, while engaged in preaching the truth as it is in Jesus. Though a faithful servant of God, yet by his brethren the Jews, he was represented as a pestilent fellow, a mover of sedition, mad, beside himself, and an *heretic*. This last charge he readily confessed; but his heresy, he declared, contained in it, worship as his fathers worshipped, belief in all the prophets, with an hope of the resurrection of all men, just and unjust.

Almost every denomination of religious people have charged each other with heresy; and there is scarcely a minister on earth, but has been by more or less charged with heresy. It has been the writer's lot to share largely in this charge, from various directions.

My first knowledge of what is now called doctrine, was what is named *Calvinism*; or that God has predetermined the eternal salvation of a few, and excluded from the possibility of salvation, all others of the human race. This system was too narrow and short for my mind, and altogether opposite to the manifestation of God in all his ways to men.

The second step, or advance of my mind was to what is now called *Arminianism*; or that God loved all; that Christ died for all; and then left it

to men, whether they would be saved or not. This in my mind, left all at uncertainty—as to coming to the knowledge of truth, or in the end obtaining eternal life.

Viewing the broad foundation laid in the love of God; the fulness of Christ; the situation of all men; the extent of the prophecies and the promises, I was led to conclude that it would be as much wisdom in God to save all in the end, as it was wisdom to make and preserve them in this world, and give them all things richly to enjoy.

The two first systems, have in times past been termed *heresies*, yea, damnable heresies; but those days are past, and these systems have by age become popular; they are now called sound doctrines, "*The doctrines of grace*;" but the last, that every man shall be presented faultless,—this, is considered damnable doctrine; the doctrine of devils; licentious doctrine, a doctrine calculated to lead men by millions to endless misery! So great an heresy, that all who believe it, believe a lie, and must be damned for ever.

Into this *heresy*, my mind was pleasingly led, by believing all things written in the law and the prophets, who uniformly declared "*the restitution of all things*"—when the mystery of God shall be finished;—in this I lived, and this I preached, six years,—having hope towards God, as it respects the resurrection of all men to glory, honour, immortality, and eternal life.

From various causes, separate from the *Scriptures* (about six months ago) I gave up the doctrine as *doubtful*, and endeavoured to preach a limited salvation; but never preached endless misery; a doctrine not named in the Bible. While labouring to work my mind into a partial doctrine—I was obliged to pass by all those glorious prophecies, which speak of endless blessings to all nations—and in the time, took particular notice of the situation of people who thought mankind would be eternally separated, and a part miserable for ever. I saw them divided among themselves, and miserable with all their religion.

After a long struggle, as Nebuchadnezzar said, my understanding came unto me, and all appeared plain. My mind is now more clearly instructed than ever in this glorious truth; *That God has given Jesus power over all flesh, for this purpose, that he should give ALL FLESH eternal life.* The following are some of the reasons for thus believing;—

1. This accords with the manifestation God has made of himself to all nations, in all ages of the world. The sun rises and shines on the evil and

good, and the rain is sent on the just, and unjust. All are in this life treated as his creatures, and as the children of his love. These things cannot be denied. This is his witness to all nations;—He does good to all, sends them rain and fruitful seasons, and fills their hearts with food and gladness. He cannot deal otherwise with all men in another state, unless his mind towards men is changed. He is of one mind, does according to his will;—is the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, nor shadow of turning.

2. A belief in the eternal salvation of all men; or that they will be delivered from sin, misery, mortality, and death, best agrees with the condition of all men. All are God's offspring;—he is the former of our bodies, and Father of our spirits;—the God of the spirits of all flesh; all souls are his;—all are under sin—all have gone out of the way—He has concluded all under sin, that he might have mercy upon all. All are in one condition by nature, and to save a part, and reject the remainder, or leave them to work their own ruin, would be partiality, and contrary to that wisdom from above, that is "without partiality."

3. This belief agrees with the desire God has implanted in the hearts of all good men, or such as have come to the knowledge of the truth in Jesus. All men who pray in the Holy Ghost, pray that all may be saved. He who has taught them thus to pray, must design to answer that request which he has taught them to make.

4. This belief gives us encouragement for the most wretched and miserable. It includes the chief of sinners, and though they may be our enemies, yet we are led to love them, knowing God loves them, and that he will finally make them his friends and ours, and bring them where they shall enjoy him, and all others.

5. This belief leads to the destruction of that spirit of party, persecution, and want of love to each other, which is so manifest among sectarians and limitarians in every part of the world, where people profess to believe in partial salvation. This leads us to ask, "Are we better than they?"—"Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not of the Gentiles also?" This leads men to unite in great things, and not to divide on account of things in themselves indifferent.

6. This belief leads us to honour God, as the Saviour of all men, and to view Christ as the Saviour of the world, not only in word, but in deed and truth. And it is the best calculated to lead men to repentance, faith, and obedience, of any doctrine ever preached to mankind.

7. The *restitution* of all things is what all the prophets spake of since the world began. This is the general testimony of all the Scriptures. To Shiloh shall the gathering of the people be. In Christ shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. "Men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him blessed." "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. All they that be fat upon the earth shall eat and wor-

ship; all they that go down to the dust shall bow before him; and none can keep alive his own soul." Psalm xxii. 27, 29. "And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things—He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces." Isa. xxv. 6-8.

The Scriptures foretell an end of transgression and sin—That all shall be gathered together in one in Christ—That all in heaven and earth shall be reconciled in Christ—That all shall in Christ be made alive, who die in Adam; and that all who have borne the image of Adam, shall bear the image of Christ—That all shall bow before him, and confess him Lord to the glory of God, and that every creature in existence shall, to the approbation of the four and twenty elders, sing, Worthy is the Lamb. That God's will shall be done in earth as in heaven. This cannot be, until there shall be none sinners, none mortal, or dead.

How glorious! how suitable to man! How honorable to God! In what harmony with the angels' song! In what harmony with the Saviour's declaration, to give all flesh eternal life.

"Here will I set up my rest,
My fluctuating heart,
From the heaven of his breast
Shall never more depart."

These things are faithful and true, and will stand for ever.

Many are now waiting for a communication from me, through some public paper; this is what my mind is settled upon as the *truth* contained in the Scriptures. I have no war with any man, nor with any sect or denomination; they are all God's offspring, and included in the number to be blest in Christ Jesus. I do not belong to any limited sectarians on earth, but to the general assembly and church of the first born that are written in heaven.

It is my choice, and my greatest happiness to be reckoned among those *preachers and believers* who preach and believe Christ will save from sin and death, Adam, Eve, and all their descendants, and hope so to live, that my connexion with them may be for our mutual good, and the increase of the knowledge of that grace which more abounds than sin.

May the preachers of this "good tidings" "be ever clothed with salvation"—may these watchmen see eye to eye, lift up their voices, and sing for joy of heart. May all believers in this true grace of God, prove by their conversation and lives, that the doctrine they embrace is the doctrine according to godliness.

May knowledge increase, hurtful divisions be done away, and all unite to crown the Saviour of the world—**LORD OF ALL.**

ELIAS SMITH.

Boston, Jan. 19, 1824.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from p. 258.)

1. We readily admit the correctness of Mr. Fitz's first assertion, that this controversy "is assuming a

curious aspect." That such is the fact, we have already expressed our surprise and regret. Certain it is that our opponent's mode of defending his system is novel, ingenious, and peculiar to himself; but, we are sorry to add, it is neither fair nor honest. It is true that he re-publishes all our remarks, but it is equally true that he "ingeniously evades answering" the most important of them. That which he cannot controvert, he ought candidly to admit, regardless of the effect which such admission may produce in the minds of his wavering proselytes. Instead of this, however, he dexterously parries the convictions of truth, with the edgeless blade of unpolished wit; or (if the figure be admissible) receives them on the "bull's hide buckler" of *obstinate misconstruction*. He reminds us of a Roman gladiator, or prize-fighter, hazarding his very existence in a contest in which there is nothing to gain but the empty applause of idle spectators, who are too indolent to think for themselves. If such be his ambition, however, he has a right to indulge it; but let him bear in mind, that when we enter the lists with him, we are actuated by much higher motives, viz. the dissemination of spiritual truth. Five smooth stones from the brook are our only weapons—the "*name of the Lord*," our watchword and motto.

2. In his *first* paragraph, Mr. Fitz says that he has "carefully avoided every mode of expression which could irritate," and promises to continue the same course. We are willing to confess that Mr. Fitz has, as yet, used no expression which *did* irritate, but that he has "carefully avoided" every one which *could* produce same excitement in minds less "milky" than our own, we feel disposed to doubt. Take the following: "We pity the man whose head and heart is so waywardly bent on *perversion* of the testimony of God's inspired servants." Again—"For the honour of human nature, we hope you are, by this time, *ashamed* of your *crooked system*." And again—"The reader, by this time, must be acquainted with Mr. W. and properly appreciate his round *barefaced assertions*." And yet again—"For once lay aside the *sin* that so easily *besets you*, and acknowledge the *truth*." Once more—"Every man of *sense* among your readers will properly estimate your *crowning*." And finally—"When we have a *man* for an opponent, we expect argument; when we have a *child*, puerility." Many others might be quoted, but let these suffice as a comment on the assertion alluded to in the commencement of this paragraph.

3. All such ebullitions of spleen we are willing to overlook, attributing them to the unsubdued tempers of the natural man; but we cannot so easily palliate his perverting the direct and positive testimony of scripture, by separating the rays of divine light with the prism of self-derived intelligence, and thus decorating impious deformity with colours stolen from the bow of heaven. Neither can we reconcile his mode of controversy with the long established and well-known usages of all honourable belligerents in polemical contests. After having fully convicted him of either a very censurable

act of carelessness, or an intention to deceive his readers, in asserting that we had evaded answering his questions, we had a right to expect an apology, or, at least, an explanation of his motives. But Mr. F. appears to have adopted, with the alteration of one word, a celebrated political maxim, which originated in this city, a few years since, viz. "All's fair in religion;" or a still older one, which says, "When *all things* unite in the cause of *truth*, why should not *falsehood* lend a hand?" In the 20th number of the Gospel Herald, Mr. F. unblushingly asserts that we had *not* answered his questions; and in the 26th number, he records all our answers, but without controverting them, for fear of "fatiguing the reader!" We have some reason to apprehend that he was deterred by a very different motive. That many of our readers, of various religious denominations, concur with us in this opinion of Mr. F.'s polemical character, appears from communications on the subject, which are now filed in this office. We, therefore, most cordially unite with him in the charitable hope, that the judgment of our readers is superior to our own.

4. We are ignorant of Mr. F.'s meaning in his *second* paragraph, where he says that we have "shifted the arrangement," of his questions. Will he please to explain himself? But the conclusion of that paragraph is of considerable importance, as it brings us, at once, to a point which, if properly discussed and understood, will remove several apparent difficulties from the subject of this controversy: Mr. F. says, "Now the reason we assign [*for the present state of affairs in this life, such as the suffering of innocent children, &c. as stated in former questions*] is, that man may be raised immortal, incorruptible, and glorious, and be made the recipient of God's perfections, which will ensure and perpetuate his happiness. If Mr. W. can assign a better one, we shall be glad to receive it."

5. We think the reason about to be assigned is better, because we believe it to be the *true* one. It is admitted on all hands, we believe, that "the present state of affairs" is *not a happy* state, and, consequently, *not a good* state; it must, therefore be an *evil* state, and could not come from God; for evil cannot flow from the fountain of all goodness. Neither can good flow from evil; and, therefore, the happy result which Mr. F. anticipates cannot be the necessary *effect* of the present state of affairs. But we assert, and are prepared to prove, that the evils we deplore are the necessary *effect* of a most lamentable *cause*, and that this cause is "man's disobedience to the divine law," for even Mr. F. admits that man has power to "do mischief." Without divesting him of this power, the cause could not have been restrained, nor the effect prevented; and to have deprived him of such power would have violated that law of divine order which secures the freedom of the human will, and have rendered man a mere machine. In speaking of this breach of the divine law, we do not allude to a particular offence committed by any one man; but to that love of evil which characterizes man in the aggregate; that love of self and the world, which

has too successfully opposed the love of God and neighbourly love.

6. There was a time when man loved God with all his mental faculties, and his neighbour as himself: when the mind of each individual was a temple of the most high—an image and likeness of God—pronounced “*very good*”—enjoying all the delights flowing from a state of love and innocence—“eastward in Eden”—the vineyard of the Lord of hosts—his pleasant plant. The mind of man was then a paradisaical garden, planted by Omnipotence himself, abounding with delectable fruits of love and wisdom, and continually fructified and refreshed by a never-ceasing stream of life and mercy. The divine fountain of good, whence all happiness flowed, was the supreme object of his love, and his neighbour was regarded as his second self.

7. But man, alas! “sought out many inventions;” and, in the search, inverted the order of his creation, turned every thing upside down, and permitted the lowest principle of his nature to aspire above those which assimilated him with angels. By virtue of his *free will*, he possessed the power of transferring his affections from heaven to earth, from God to self; and, in process of time, the unhappy transfer was gradually effected. From adoring the fountain, he began to contemplate the stream, till, forgetting its source, he madly imagined it originated in himself, and began to doubt every thing which he could not conceive with the senses. Being compounded of three distinct principles, (voluntary, rational, and sensual,) each of which was innocent in its own proper place, he unhappily inverted their order, by suffering the last and lowest to obtain the ascendancy. This elevation of the *sensual* principle was giving a fascinating power to the serpent, which proved fatal to the giver. Rationality is a *masculine* principle, and self-love, *feminine*. The former is therefore called *man*, and the latter *woman*. The *sensual* principle, (which, in the language of inspiration, is called a *serpent*), first introduced doubts and reasonings concerning the mysteries of faith; and, through the persuasion of *self-love*, the rational principle consented to imbibe the forbidden idea of self-sufficiency. This was that accursed fruit which had been prohibited; so “pleasant to the eyes,” so desirable “to make one wise in his own conceit,” and yet so fatal to spiritual life, “in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” But what said sensuality? “Eat, (said the serpent,) and imagine thyself a God—thou shalt not surely die—all men will be saved—HALLELUJAH!” The great Dr. Clarke says, this serpent was an *Ourang-outang*. We do not believe it. At any rate, he then preached the same doctrine that is now advocated in the *Gospel Herald*! Man ate, and knew his Creator no more.

8. Such was the fall of man, and such the cause of “the present state of affairs.” The love of self, thus acquired, has descended from father to son, in regular succession, while each generation has increased its magnitude by “many inventions” of their own—except where its hereditary course has been arrested by the work of regeneration. To re-

store to man the power of performing this work, to instruct him in its nature, and to provide a divine medium through which he might be continually assisted in the process, was the object of Jehovah’s incarnation, when “God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself,” for “in Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” All mankind (mark this, Mr. Fitz,) were thus redeemed from a bondage, and from shackles, to which they had voluntarily submitted. All were thus redeemed—and all, we are very willing to admit, might also be saved, if they would only make a proper use of the liberty to which they have been restored, by co-operating with God in their own regeneration. If every one did so, the labours of Mr. Fitz would be superfluous.

9. In reply to Mr. F.’s third paragraph, we repeat, that it does imply a contradiction to say, “God is able to save man, and make him holy and happy, against his own will.” Recollect, Sir, you have admitted that “man can do mischief,” and is, so far at least, a *free agent*. We therefore, once more ask, “How can we conceive of a greater contradiction in terms, or a more palpable absurdity, than the following proposition: *God can compel a FREE agent to choose, think, feel, act, and enjoy, in direct opposition to his own choice, wishes, thoughts and desires?*” It was not necessary for Mr. F. so pompously to demand the definition of the term *agent*, as he has in a subsequent part of his remarks. We are not ignorant that the word is susceptible of two definitions. Its legitimate meaning, Mr. F. well knows, is very different from that which is given it by merchants and lawyers. The latter will tell you, that “an *agent* is a substitute, a deputy, a person employed to act for another.” But Mr. F., who knows its etymology, is well aware, that according to the legitimate meaning of the word, *God is an agent*; and we believe, that even the editor of the *Gospel Herald* will not have the hardihood to say, that God is a substitute, a deputy, or that he is employed to act for another. An agent, therefore, is a being who acts or operates; and a *free agent* is a being who acts freely, whose actions are voluntary; who, being endowed with discretionary powers, exercises them according to his own will and wisdom. We state this solely for the benefit of the readers of the *Gospel Herald*. The editor is too apt to throw dust in their eyes when it suits his purpose. (To be continued.)

REMARKS.

The first three paragraphs of Mr. Woodworth’s Reply, contained in this Number, may be tolerated, as they are the effusions of a “milky” mind. And we are, on the whole, pleased with the information, that Mr. W. has received letters of condolence from his friends, who would have been deficient in sympathy, if they had not come forward and cheered him in his sorrows. This is all very well. We are sorry for Mr. W. that his condition is so deplorable as to make an escape in circumlocution indispensable. Whether he will effect this, remains to be seen.

Mr. W. introduces our reply, as from the *Gospel*

Herald of Nov. 8, (No. 26.) when the fact is, that a part of it is from our 27th Number, and the division not the most judicious by any means. It is proper to mention this, that our readers may find the declarations alluded to.

In answer to the inquiry in Mr. W.'s *fourth* paragraph, we remark, that our interrogation anticipated a reply to the whole, that "a sufficient reason cannot be given," unless it be *first* admitted that God's mercy is *infinite*. Mr. W.'s *fifth, sixth, and seventh* paragraphs, are an attempt to assign a *better reason* for the permission of the present state of affairs, than the reason we have assigned. He has decided that the present state of affairs is an "evil state, and could not come from God." He says he is "prepared to prove, that the evils we deplore are the *necessary effect* of a most lamentable cause," &c. Sir, was the cause as necessary as the effect? It is the state, in which the particular evils are generated, that is spoken of. You must admit the affinity which exists between the effect and the cause. Now, Sir, read the following—"I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these." (Isa. xlv. 7.) Can you disprove this? Is the present state of affairs necessary, or unnecessary? You, Sir, contend, that the evil is the effect of "man's disobedience to the Divine law." Man's disobedience is the cause. To have deprived man of the power to disobey, would have "violated the law of Divine order," &c. Therefore, you, Sir, with all your circumlocution, have run hard aground upon the conclusion, that the present state of affairs is according to the law of Divine order. For a contrary conduct, on the part of Deity, would violate the law of Divine order.

You, Sir, declare, that "man turned every thing upside down." Man's free will did this. Is it agreeable to the law of Divine order, to have "every thing turned upside down?" Would it "violate the law of Divine order," to prevent "man from turning every thing upside down?" If it would, then it follows, that the "turning every thing upside down," is not contrary to "the law of Divine order." Sir, we fear you "darken counsel by words without knowledge." A wiser than you has declared, "That which is born [or produced] of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the spirit is spirit." The flesh is the operating cause of the present state of affairs. You decide that "man is a compound of three distinct principles." Who compounded man thus? Was not this compounding, the cause of the present state of affairs?

You, Sir, decide, that the "serpent preached the same doctrine that is now advocated in the Gospel Herald." Sir, the Serpent was a liar. And we are liars, if we say, that sin will not produce death. Seriously, Sir, consider, whether you are actuated by the Serpent, or by the Spirit of truth, in this accusation. If you have told the truth, you can easily name the page, column, and paragraph, of this Paper, which preaches the doctrine you speak of. We ask you to do this. Sir, remember, slander and argument, are two things.

Mr. W.'s eighth paragraph, explains redemption

to consist in "restoring to man the power of performing this work"—"regeneration." Ah, Sir, we like the Bible best; that says, "In whom [Christ,] we have redemption, through his blood, [what is it?] the forgiveness of sins." (Ephes. i. 7.) This, Sir, is the doctrine we teach; is it the doctrine of the Serpent?

Mr. W.'s ninth paragraph is devoted to *free agency*. Sir, we admit that God is an Agent, in the sense that he has the power of operating. But man, lives, moves, and has his being in God, therefore, is not an agent. Has man power, as God has power? No. If God is an Agent, man is not. The Bible, and we like this old Book, says, of man, that "to do good he has no knowledge." A free agent without knowledge! Sir, you are welcome to him. (To be continued.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

FORCE UNDER THE NAME OF WORSHIP.

For ages past, men have been taught that *worship* cannot stand without the aid of Magistrates, or the power of the sword. Much has been said against the American Government, on account of one part of the Constitution, which says—"Congress shall make no laws respecting religion." The argument is, that without the aid of government, Religion will finally be driven from the earth. A large portion of the people of the United States, are against a religion upheld by the government, and at the same time they retain the principle. There must be some force—something to terrify people, or they will not try to "get religion." They must be taught that a terrible punishment awaits them in another world, if they do not believe their preaching before they die.

Where is the origin of this dreadful, unnatural, unrighteous principle? Is it in parental government? Do parents, to make their children obedient, threaten them with hunger, torture, banishment, or death? No. Did Jesus, who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; did he use force? No,—"Come unto me, all ye that labour," was his language.

Did Moses threaten his nation with endless punishment, if they did not love their God and their brethren? This force, under the name of worship, originated in Babylon, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. He was the man who began it, and it has risen higher, until God, who is love itself, is represented as treating his offspring in the same manner Nebuchadnezzar did his subjects, with this difference, the king meant to burn them to death at once, but God, the gracious and merciful, whose tender mercies are over all his works; mercies which endure for ever; he will punish all who do not worship him, with misery for ever, without a possibility of deliverance.

See the likeness between Nebuchadnezzar's religion, and much of what is declared true worship in our day.

1st. He set up an image of gold in the plain of Dura. 2d. All people, tongues, and languages, were commanded to bow before it, and threatened with

the flames of the furnace, if they dared to rebel. 3d. All the authority of the *king*, all the authority of the *rulers*, in the kingdom, all the majesty of the *image*, all the power of *music*, and all the horrors of the *furnace* are against the man who shall refuse to become *religious*. Every man almost, will call this wickedness and cruelty. View the religion which has been forced upon people for ages past, and see the likeness! Men are taught that God has made a furnace, or hell of fire, to torture for ever, all who do not worship him according to the commandments and doctrines of men. They are taught that God has made a most powerful being, called the *DEVIL* and *SATAN*, who has the charge of this eternal furnace. That his work is, to draw to this place, the greatest part of mankind; that after he has led them there, or they are at last given to him; God will uphold him eternally to torment them, and that he will uphold them for ever to be tormented, without any honour to him, or benefit to them.

The preacher, well fed, the first in fashion, in rich attire, ascends the pulpit; adjusts his hair, hand, gloves, and handkerchief, and begins to represent the *sovereignty* of his God, his right to take one out of ten or an hundred, the importance of being willing to be eternally miserable, &c.

Before he closes, he acts the part of Nebuchadnezzar's herald, and tells them, if they do not believe his preaching, they shall be cast alive into God's furnace, and "*die the death that never dies!*" "Go on, (says he) go on in the ways of sin, until you come to the brink of ruin, and God will plunge you in."

For all this, they are largely paid, live in ease, and appear to care but little for the lot of ninety-nine out of an hundred, who are to burn for ever.

To support this worship, men have been forced from all they hold dear on earth, and committed to the flames, because they would not bow to such an *Idol*. Their property has been forced from them to support these ministers; compelled to attend such worship once in three months, or have their money taken by *force* to support such cruelty under the name of religion.

Is this the worship of God in spirit and truth? True worship and salvation are in harmony. "We know what we worship, salvation is of the Jews." Take the *devil* and *hell* or *endless misery*, out of the preacher's confession of faith, and what would he preach? Those who preach salvation, and not eternal damnation, are represented as leading men to destruction; but they are leading them from it. God increase the number, who shall testify against this false worship!

FALSE BRETHREN!

"False brethren" are nothing new. Paul suffered from them; therefore, we may expect the same. By "*false brethren*," we understand mere *pretenders*, who are described by Christ, as follows—*Mat. xiii. 20, 21*. "But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it. Yet hath he not root in himself but dureth for a while: for when

tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended." The account we published in our 38th Number, by "*A Late Universalist*," corroborates the declaration of Christ. God's word, which is life, has no root in him. We have his pretended Universalism from his own mouth. "It was directly adapted to *banish all serious impressions from the mind*." This man, who, on his own confession, was almost, if not quite devoid of "*serious impressions*" for several years, now has the impudence and wickedness to slander thousands of *sincere* people, who seriously and devoutly trust in God, and pray always in reference to His holy will and pleasure.

According to this man, Universalists quote scripture *disconnectedly*. To rebut this foolish charge, we refer the accuser to the whole Scriptures, which we offer in evidence of the truth of the doctrine, that "*All nations whom God hath made shall come and worship before Him; and shall glorify His name*."

If this man can be believed, he is the most abandoned vile wretch the earth ever was cumbered with. He declares, "he became fully convinced, that his *impenitence* and *guilt* merited *endless punishment*." For the Scripture assures us, that Jerusalem received of the Lord's hand *double* for *all* her sins. *Isa. xl. 2*. But this man is so much worse than rebellious Israel, that a whole eternity is necessary to punish him according to his *deserts*. Sir, whoever you may be, if you can be believed, you are so abominably wicked, that you honour the cause of *Truth* by your rejection of it.

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION.

The Southern Association of Universalists, held their annual meeting at Milford, (Mass.) Dec. 9, 1823. They chose brother Richard Carrique Moderator, and brother Jacob Frieze Clerk. Four sermons were delivered, and brothers Eliphalet Case jr. and Calvin Gardner received letters of fellowship.

A committee, consisting of Brs. Hosea Ballou, David-Pickering, Jacob Frieze, R. Carrique, and Hosea Ballou 2d, was chosen to "draught proposals of reconciliation between those brethren who are the authors of the 'Appeal and Declaration' and this association." The committee presented the following proposals:

Whereas certain publications, called an "Appeal to the public, and a Declaration to the world," have been construed to indicate a disfellowship, as expressed in a Resolve of the Southern Association, the undersigned authors of the Declaration, being possessed of a fervent desire to restore the happy union and fellowship of our religious order, and to enjoy ourselves, and to assist our brethren to reciprocate with us the inestimable blessings of harmony and brotherly love, desire to remove all difficulties above noted, by certifying that we do most cordially acknowledge and accept, as christian ministers and brethren, such as differ from us on the subject of doctrine, maintained in the above named publications. And we receive and consider the accep-

tance of this proposal by the Association, as an assurance on their part, that they reciprocate the sentiments and feelings of christian fellowship above mentioned.

EDWARD TURNER,
BARZILLAI STREETER,
CHARLES HUDSON.

Voted that the same is fully satisfactory to this Association, in relation to the signers thereof, and that this body reciprocate the christian feeling and fellowship therein expressed.

They adjourned to meet at Attleborough on the 2d Wednesday and Thursday in June next.

Bost. Univer. Mag.

SALARY OFFICERS.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, have provided a snug birth, and a handsome salary for J. Evarts, Esq. their corresponding Secretary. Here is an extract from the proceedings of the annual meeting:

"The committee recommended that the sum of ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS be granted to Jeremiah Evarts, Esq. as Corresponding Secretary of the Board; and that the further sum of ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS be allowed to him as Editor of the Missionary Herald. * * * * This report was accepted."

Two thousand dollars a year exceed in amount the salary of either governor in five of the eastern states. Rhode-Island and Connecticut contained in 1820, 353,000 inhabitants—yet the annual salary of Secretary Evarts far surpasses the united salaries of the governors of these two states. The governors of New-Hampshire and Vermont, have each an annual salary of \$1000—Secretary Evarts has \$2000 per annum. What can be the arduous duties of his office? He is allowed \$1000 a year for editing the Missionary Herald, a work which has more buyers than readers. It is nearly destitute of original matter—and requires no more talent to conduct it than to turn a grindstone. But the orthodox committee give their reasons. Let them speak for themselves.

"The principal reasons were, in brief, that the Corresponding Secretary should, in order to the uninterrupted discharge of the duties of his office, be free from care and anxiety as to providing the means of support for his family; and that the sum specified is no more than a suitable support."

Many of our honest farmers in the country look upon \$2000 as a great estate. Who, that has a family, is free from care and anxiety? Our credulous contributors have hitherto supposed that the avails of their toil and sweat went to aid in the conversion of British Hindoos—and not to fatten Boston Bond-street loungers.

Plain Truth.

EXPLANATION, &c.

The following relates to the communication of "A Rhode-Island Universalist," recently published in this paper, where Br. Kneeland is named as formerly a Baptist.

"It is true that Mr. Kneeland once joined a Baptist church, from which he has never been either dismissed or excommunicated to his knowledge, though he received an admonition for preaching

what was believed by them to be false doctrine; viz. the final restitution of all things, (for at that time he believed in a future limited punishment after death,) but he never believed in the cruel and unmerciful doctrine of *endless misery*! and this was known to the minister, deacons, and other leading members of the church, at the time he was admitted a member, for which reason (as nothing was brought against his moral character) it was with the greatest difficulty that they could get a vote in the church to lay him under admonition, as many members who are now living can testify. The Editors of the Magazine, and all others who shall give the above publicity, are requested to insert this note.

EDITOR OF THE GAZETTEER."

AWFUL WARNINGS!

In Goffstown, (N. H.) Mr. Benjamin Stevens, aged 68, fell dead, while in the act of carrying a quarter of meat as a *present to his minister*.

We give this in orthodox style. Preachers of terror convert the most common occurrences into judgments. Now we have as good authority for saying this man died in consequence of carrying meat to give his *minister*, as they have for their *Awful Warnings*. However, we are bound in justice to say, that the deceased was engaged in a laudable employment, if his minister was *poor*. If the case was otherwise, we do not conceive the sin to be so heinous as to call for the special interposition of offended Heaven.

"Among others whom he [Swedenborg] repeatedly saw, was *John Calvin*. Of the condition of *Calvin* in the future world, we have the following picture: that at his death, it was sometime before the angels could convince him that he had actually exchanged worlds; that his followers were all confined in dungeons and caves, because they believed the doctrine of predestination; that he himself was miserable lonesome, having none with whom he could associate; that for a long time he hid himself in a dark corner; that he next lodged in the house of harlots; and finally, Swedenborg left him shut up in a cave with his followers, where they laboured for their food, and made it their business and delight to quarrel and do each other mischief."

Chris. Mirror.

UNIVERSALISM.

Courtesy prompts us to answer to the appellation of *Universalist*. We use this term because common acceptance has defined it to mean one who believes in "the *restitution of all things*." Our faith is simple in the extreme. We believe in "One only living and true God," who "is *Love*." That his purposes are according to *Love*; and that he will do all his pleasure, which is also in accordance with *Love*. We believe in the *Son of God*, the Lord Jesus Christ, that he is "the *bread of God* which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." We believe God is the *Father of all*. That his law is *Love*. And we also believe,

that his law, *love*, shall be put into the mind, and *written in the hearts of men*; and that this law of love, is our perfect rule of conduct.

Wonderful to relate, the "Late Universalist" (in the Boston Recorder) says, "I believe it to be a *false doctrine*, of the most *fatal tendency*." We believe it to be a *true doctrine*, of the most *blessed tendency*. Therefore, "we beseech men by the *mercies of God*." (Rom. xii. 1.)

EXTRACT FROM PETITPIERE.

That the *Supreme Being* is perfectly good, is so important a truth, that the whole of religion depends on it. When I am assured that Goodness is the Origin, and happiness the Object of all the dealings of God, both towards myself and every other creature, my soul feels its anchor of hope to be sure and steadfast. Though *His ways should be in the deep, and his paths in the mighty waters*,—though the severest affliction should be my portion,—all this shall not impair my confidence in Him. I will never, by a moment's distrust, dishonour that Being who has graciously commanded me to *cast all my care on him, because he careth for me*.

But if I indulge any doubts of this truth, or admit any doctrine incompatible with it, I lose my assurance, and with that, all my comfort. Religion then presents nothing to my mind but terror and destruction. The prospect of futurity fills me with alarm, and the thought of immortality distracts me. The Infinite Jehovah appears no longer amiable or lovely; and every pious sentiment expires within me, when I can no longer love him. Should the benevolence and sympathy, which are innate in the human mind, survive, they could, alas! only aggravate my misery! So certain is it that the whole of religion depends on the doctrine of the infinite goodness of God.

And if this is the case, it follows, that every doctrine incompatible with goodness is not only false, but also pernicious to the last degree. * * * *

Let not mankind, then, allow themselves to suppress this truth, on account of an apprehension that it will be abused. This would be tacitly to deny that it is the will of God that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth; and virtually to assert that ignorance and error are the better means for conducting some men to salvation. It would also necessarily suppose that the proper way to inspire mankind with affection for their Creator, is by representing Him to them as a Being infinitely cruel!

But lest sinners should abuse this truth, so little understood, it is necessary that it be rightly explained to them; so that they shall not abandon themselves to fatal delusions respecting either the severity or forbearance of God. O God! Thou Being supremely good! cause the precious light of thy truth to illuminate all hearts, that they may be filled with love and thy peace; and for this purpose, do thou *open the lips* of thy ministers, *that they may show forth thy praise*.—Amen.

"Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God."

A SMALL REQUEST.

Our Brother Editors would confer a favour by omitting the word **REVEREND**, affixed to the names of our Brethren who publicly advocate the truth. It will save us the trouble of expunging this word from all extracts we publish from their papers, when the names of our officiating brethren are introduced. We have conscientious scruples in this. No offence is intended, when we say, that we never knew a *reverend* preacher of the truth. If any of our brethren should persist in claiming a title to distinguish them from others, that of *Major* or *Captain*, would be more appropos than *Reverend*, while that of *servant* would be a more becoming title. In our 38th Number we expunged the word *reverend* where it occurred, affixed to the names of *twenty-five* persons, not one of whom deserves the title. The Scriptures assure us, that *God's name is Reverend*. We have yet to learn, that those men who *profess* to be the *meek servants* of Christ, are authorized to covet titles, and to seize upon one which is *exclusively* the property of **JEHOVAH**. It is quite too much for those who traduce God's character, to rob him of his name or title. Well instructed scribes should do better.

NEW PUBLICATION.

Mr. Balfour's Work will be published towards the close of the present month. All persons, who have obtained subscribers, are requested to make returns of them immediately, to Mr. S. Etheridge, the publisher; as a small edition of the work is only printed, after subscribers are supplied, its price will be raised to \$2 50.

Charlestown, (Mass.) Jan. 7, 1824.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—ISA. ix. 6.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on **TUESDAY** Evening next, at half past 6 o'clock.

The Basement Story of the Church, erected by the Second Society of United Christian Friends, on the corner of Prince and Orange-streets, will be opened for worship of "the God of the whole earth," every Sabbath; at half-past ten in the morning, half-past two in the afternoon, and at half-past six o'clock in the evening. Also, every Thursday evening, at seven o'clock, when it is expected our Brother Mitchell will officiate.

Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1824.

NO. 41.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—Perhaps there is not a more bitter spirit, manifested toward the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness, in any part of our country, than is manifested in the town of Southold, by those who consider themselves orthodox. The zeal they possess, cannot be said to be less than was Saul's of Tarsus, while on his way to Damascus; for he verily thought he was doing God service, and we do not dispute the sincerity of our friends any more than we do the sincerity of Saul, though we believe Saul to have been sincere and zealous, we think he was so without knowledge; and in like manner we think our friends possess a zeal, but not according to knowledge.

Professing to believe that God wills the salvation of *all* men, and that he worketh all things according to the counsel of that will, of course I am considered as an heretic by these, our zealous friends. They will sympathize, and lament that so many in our world are giving credence to such a fabulous doctrine as that which is taught by Universalists, and as one said in my hearing, "I thank God I have never been left to embrace that sentiment"—the expression seemed to comport with one of old, who stood and cried, "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men, or as this poor publican." Without allowing themselves the liberty of reasoning on the subject, they generally vent a spirit of animosity; and an expression of ludicrous scorn is frequently the substitute for reason. As the majority of our friends seem not to have a desire to understand the doctrine taught by all God's holy prophets, viz. "*the restitution of all things*," and as verbal reasoning is disagreeable to them, I have thought, that, possibly, some out of curiosity, if a reason were given through the medium of the Gospel Herald, might read it, and by that means be led to reflect on the impropriety of assertion without proof.

The Lord saith, "Come now, and let us *reason* together; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." They shall be! no condition here—none but those, whose sins are as scarlet or crimson, have any part or lot in the matter. The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. Paul says, "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," &c. He never came to call the *righteous* but sinners to repentance. His errand was, to seek and to save them that were (in the past tense) lost. The lost sheep of the house of Israel, were those to whom he was sent, and the Gospel contemplates the salvation of none, but those

who come under the appellation of sinners. But mark the distinction, between being saved *in*, and *from* sin; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall become white like wool. Not that they *may* become so. The sins of the people shall be burnt. "If any man's work be burnt he shall suffer loss, but he shall be saved, yet so as by fire." He shall suffer the loss of *his works*, and when this takes place he ceases to be a sinner. For the man's works are sins.

We read that Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil; and not only this, but the Devil himself, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Now what is it, that causes this fear? Doubtless it is unbelief. Unbelief of what? Of a certain something. Is that something a fact, existing anterior to believing? Most certainly; or our believing makes that true, which before was false. "But what if some believe not, shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect?" I may believe the sun will rise to-morrow; but does my belief cause the sun to rise? Again, I may disbelieve that the sun will rise, does my unbelief hinder the sun from rising? I may believe Jesus Christ to be *my* Saviour, but does my *belief* make him my Saviour? I may disbelieve him as my Saviour; does my unbelief hinder him from being my Saviour?

There is a fact proposed to be believed, and that fact is as follows—That God hath (in the past tense) given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. If we believe this fact, we have the witness in ourselves—if we disbelieve this fact we make God a liar. An apostle says, "We who have believed do (in the present tense) enter into rest." But is there any rest for the unbeliever? No! Is there rest to him who believes that by far the greater part of mankind will be endlessly miserable? Impossible! Fathers and mothers, does this give you rest, to believe that you will arrive in heaven, and your dear children be cast into an endless hell? Husbands, does the belief, that you and your beloved consorts, will be endlessly separated, afford you consolation? Does it give you rest? To you who believe in the heart-rending, and God-dishonouring doctrine of endless misery, I would put a serious question—Have you entered into *rest*, while under the conviction of that belief? You certainly cannot answer in the affirmative; then, of course, you cannot be the recipients of that rest, spoken of in the text, nor can any be, but those who believe "God to be the Saviour of all men," as well as "specially of them that believe." The mystery of God's will according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in

himself, is made known unto us, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and on earth even in him. (Ephes. i.) Doubtless, many who pretend to believe and know their Master's will, are destitute of this rest, which the faith that works by love produces. To such, the following text will apply—"He that knoweth his Master's will, and doeth it not, shall be beaten with many stripes."

There is nothing that shines more perspicuous, through the whole tenour of scripture, than this truth, that *God wills the salvation of all men*. Shall his will be done? Certainly, if we are to give the following any credit, "Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will." Christ says, "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." Has he power to accomplish it? "All power in heaven and earth are given unto me. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand; all that the Father giveth me shall come unto me, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." But the objector may say, that the scripture declares, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, all the nations that forget God." True, but are we to understand this *hell* to be in a *future* world? Does not David say, "Great is thy mercy toward me, and thou hast delivered my soul from the *lowest hell*." The pains of hell gat (in the past tense) hold on me?" &c. If when David uttered the expression, that "the wicked shall be turned into hell," &c. he meant to be understood an *endless* hell, what does he mean when he says, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord! for the kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the Governor among the nations." It appears to me, a more inconsistent book could not be written by mortal man, than the Bible, if we are to understand hell (in one solitary instance) to mean a place of *endless misery*. Where will hell be, when the Devil and his works are destroyed? Was not Christ manifested for the express purpose of their destruction? Can it be possible that any one can be so puerile as to believe that God will not effect his purpose!

But, says the objector, *eternal death* is threatened to the disobedient. Pray tell me where? "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." We believe this to be a *spiritual* death, and we believe it was experienced on the day of transgression. We believe that man died to his former happiness. We believe that the ground was cursed for his sake, and that the sorrow of women in travail is in consequence of the fall. We have no authority to extend the curse any farther. We think whoever does, does it at the expense of violating God's word. For, if God's word be true, he will triumph over death and hell.

But the objector may say, "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment." Does this word necessarily imply an *endless* duration? If so, was the *everlasting* priesthood of Aaron *endless*? Was the everlasting possession of Canaan *endless*? Were

the everlasting mountains that were to be scattered, endless? The learned tell us, that this is from the Greek word *aionion*. We read of the ages to come. Now this word (ages) the learned likewise say, is from the same root as everlasting. What sense should we discover, if we were to read it thus—In the endless eternities to come? We read likewise, of the mystery which has been hid from ages; say from endless eternities. What sense will you make of it? The word everlasting ought to be understood according to the subject and the connexion. In Matt. xxv. where it is said, "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment," &c. the words do not have any reference to *futurity*. Have you discovered in this chapter, that Christ was to set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left, and send the goats into everlasting punishment at the time when he was to come in his glory? Have you ever noticed the 24th chap. and 30th verse, that they should "see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory," and his sending his angels with the sound of a trumpet? Have you noticed the 34th verse, "Verily I say unto you, *this generation* shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled?" That is, Christ come in his glory. Matt. xvi. 27, 28, reads thus, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and *then* shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be *some standing here*, which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." One of two things must be admitted, either this 25th chapter of Matthew was fulfilled before the death of some to whom he (then) spoke, or some who then lived are still alive.

The Scriptures abound with promises of rewards and punishments, for good and bad works. But, not with *infinite* rewards and punishments. If it does so, we ask, Can man be rewarded or punished according to his works? Will the best man on earth have the assurance, to say his works are *infinitely* better than the worst man's living? And yet we are told (by orthodoxy) that by far the greatest part of mankind will be miserable as long as God exists; and a certain *few* (good folks) to be endlessly happy. This is called *rewarding* according to our works. As much as to say, I have done so many *infinitely* good acts, that I must have an infinite reward of happiness in consequence; while the poor wicked man, has committed so many *infinitely* bad acts, that he deserves an infinite punishment. We believe that "every transgression shall receive a just recompense of reward," whether the transgressor be a believer or not. We believe the same God that punishes one will punish the other. Chastisement received from the hand of God, is nothing more nor less than wholesome discipline, in order to the reclaiming of the prodigal; and we venture to affirm, that God never did, nor ever will, inflict any punishment on man, but for the express purpose of man's *good*. "If ye be without chastisement whereof all are partakers, thou art ye bastards and not sons. Now no chastisement for the present seemeth joyous, but grievous, nevertheless, it yieldeth the peace-

able fruits of righteousness unto all them that are exercised thereby. Our light afflictions which are but for a moment work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." In short, God chastises us for our profit, that we may be made partakers of his holiness. For what purpose does a father punish his child, but for his good? The goodness of God is manifested, when we behold him as a Father, punishing for the good of the punished. But when we view him (tyrant-like) possessing a spirit of vindictive fury, his beauty vanishes; and we know not what to make of David when he says, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works."

ONESIMUS.

Southold, (L. I.) Dec. 23, 1823.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY.

(Continued from p. 316.)

1. With respect to the *fore-knowledge* of God, we feel the difficulty, nay, we despair of expressing ourselves in such a manner as to be understood by a man who is ignorant of the fact, that there is an *internal sense* beneath the *letter* of the Word of God, a "*spirit* which giveth life," within that *letter* which is of itself lifeless. But as we hope that some of Mr. Fitz's readers may see those things which can only be "*spiritually discerned*," and which consequently appear like "*foolishness unto him*," we will offer a few words on the subject.

2. The invisible spiritual world is the world of *causes*, and the visible material universe is the world of *effects*; because the former is *in* and pervades the latter, as the *soul* of man is *in* and pervades his whole *body*, and as the invisible essence of every created thing is *in* and pervades its whole visible *form*. Let it be remembered, therefore, that by the *spiritual world* we do not mean a distant country, beyond the stars, comprising a *local* heaven, and a *local* hell, with a *local* region between them; but we mean the *internals* of the human mind, in which one of these three *states* must necessarily exist. We mean the will and understanding of man, as influenced by his voluntary association with good or evil spirits. Every one *has* such a world within himself, (either heavenly, or infernal, or proximate to one of them,) though many have been too thoughtless or indolent to make the discovery.

"There is a world, the world of mind,
By neither time nor space confin'd;
And when we cease in flesh to dwell,
That world will be our heaven or hell."

3. God only sees effects *in* their causes, and thus he sees all things. Not even a sparrow can fall to the ground without a *spiritual* cause, and *in* that cause is the effect seen by the divine eye. All *causes* exist prior to their effects; consequently before the *cause* exists there is no *effect* to be seen. God is *in* and sees *all truth*; but that which does not yet exist (even in its cause or first principles) is not a truth, and of course cannot be seen. We have just shown that the lamentable fall and degeneracy of man was *not* the necessary effect of his

being "*created upright*," and, consequently, could not be seen (or, if Mr. F. pleases, foreseen) *in* his creation, as an effect is seen *in* its cause. Let Mr. F. point out the *cause* of man's present degeneracy, and we will then show how the divine eye could see the effect *in* it; and prove that, after the existence of the cause, the effect could not be prevented.

4. In the foregoing observations Mr. Fitz will find a sufficient reply to his *fifth* paragraph, we will, therefore, now proceed to the *five* succeeding ones.

5. And here we contend that apostolic testimony is in perfect harmony with our own, notwithstanding our opponent's flourishes, and brackets, and *admiration points!!!* which give his printer much trouble to very little purpose. Is *obtaining* a spiritual victory, through divine assistance, a new idea to Mr. Fitz? We cannot believe it, for he must have encountered temptations like other men. Why, then, this playing on the word *obtain*? It reminds us of the celebrated Stanislaus, who, by a similar method, arrested the attention of his auditors, while he executed a *trick of deception*. Fie! Mr. Fitz! how childish is such trifling in a controversy like this; it is too puerile for one who professes to be a champion of truth. Do we not *obtain* every thing that we *receive conditionally*? And who does not know that the only condition on which we can receive a crown of victory is *to fight and overcome*. How does our Saviour use this word when he speaks of those "*which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world*," meaning heaven? The apostle, with whom Mr. F. says we are at issue, exhorts his converts in these words, "*So run that ye may obtain*." Did he ever insinuate that they might *obtain* without running? John says, "*I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one*." Did they not *obtain a victory* over the wicked one? We confess, and rejoice to confess, that *God gives us the power*, and that without him we can do nothing. But we still insist, that unless we faithfully exercise the power which God continually gives us, no victory will be given or obtained. Did not David, by the exercise of his derived power, *obtain* a victory over Goliath? Did not Judah *obtain* a victory when "*he drave out the inhabitants of the mountain*?" We know that the Lord was with him, which was the case also when he *vainly attempted* to drive out the inhabitants of the valley, and did *not* obtain a victory, "*because they had chariots of iron*." But why multiply quotations? Every victory is *obtained* by an exercise of the proper *means*, and Heaven never *gives* one on any other condition. We sincerely pity a writer who finds himself driven to such miserable shifts, as does this editor of the Gospel Herald.

6. Paul says, "*If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things [with such a man] are passed away; behold all things are become new; and all things are of God*." That is, every thing appertaining to such a *regenerated* man, is of God. Nothing but ignorance, or a wilful misconstruction

of the passage, can draw any other meaning from it. And yet our opponent seizes hold of the words *all things*, to prove the salvation of *all men*! "Hard push'd" again. Will his readers believe that there is no *if* in the above quotation? He has boldly asserted that this word does not occur in the third chapter of Colossians, when we quoted the first verse ("IF ye then be risen with Christ") to prove that *all men* were not so risen. The chapter commences with the word *if*, and the same word occurs again in the 13th verse. What will the reader think of Mr. Fitz's veracity?

7. With respect to man's *reconciliation to God*, Mr. Fitz appears to be still more in the dark, and we feel it our duty to throw in his path (by reflection) a ray of that spiritual light which we have received from the Word. We know that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;" but that something is to be done on the part of man, appears plainly from this exhortation, which immediately follows: "We pray you, in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God.*" An exhortation like this is sheer nonsense, if the persons addressed can have no possible agency in the act of being thus reconciled. But the fact is, the whole tenor of the apostolic writings inculcate the following idea: The *divinity* was in the *humanity*, reconciling, or uniting the *latter* to the *former*; and the apostle exhorts the Corinthians to become partakers of this reconciliation, by becoming new creatures "in Christ." We wish Mr. Fitz to bear in mind that this reconciliation was not effected by the *humanity*, but by the *divinity within it*; not by Christ, but in Christ; and that the work was not performed to reconcile God to the world, but to reconcile the world to God.

8. Now let us turn to a parallel passage in the gospel, to enable us to understand the true meaning of the word *world*. Our Lord says, in John xvi. 33. "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the *world*." (See also 1 John, v. 4.) It is surely more reasonable, in this passage, to understand that he overcame the *worldly principles*, and the influence of the world upon them which were excited by the tempter in the wilderness, than that he overcame the people of the world. If this be correct, we may learn from the apostle that God and man were reconciled by the Godhead operating in the *humanity*, and the *humanity co-operating* therewith, to the subjugation of those hereditary, worldly, and contaminated principles, derived from the *human mother*, and which were necessarily transmitted to her offspring. As these were gradually and successively subdued and ejected, all those holy principles which existed in man before the fall, (when he was in harmony with the divine nature,) were implanted in their place by the *divinity within*.

9. Thus was God and man, or the divine and human nature, reconciled, as the apostle declares in Rom. v. 10, "For if when we [*that is, the human nature generally*] were enemies [*in a state of spiritual hostility to God, and the holy things which are communicated from him*] we were reconciled to God by the DEATH of his Son, [*that is, by the ope-*

ration of the sufferings of the humanity, in extinguishing that life which must be laid down before life eternal can be found,] much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his LIFE," [or, by the communication of that LIFE which the humanity received from the divinity, in consequence of the laying down of the principles of life inherited from the mother.]

10. We wish Mr. Fitz to understand further, that this reconciliation, as we are informed in the gospel, was progressively effected, John xii. 28, and was completed when the humanity, as to the body, expired on the cross, declaring, at the same time, "It is finished!" Every principle of life derived from the mother, and consequently tainted by the fall, was then extinguished; and the humanity was purified, and prepared to rise on the resurrection morn, perfectly glorified, and entirely *one with the divinity*. Thus was constituted an eternal medium of access to the in-dwelling Jehovah, and of the communication of the Holy Spirit, which, we are informed in John vii. 39, did not exist until Jesus was thus glorified; and by which the divine image is to be restored in all those who follow the Lord in the regeneration, even as that image was restored in the humanity, which was the "express image of the Father's person." These regenerate sons of God, by adoption and grace, are they (and they only) who can say with the apostle, "We also joy in God [*the essential divine nature*] through our Lord Jesus Christ, [*the divine or glorified human nature,*] by whom we have received the atonement."

11. In the whole of the fifth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans, he shows the nature of the atonement, or reconciliation, and the cause of its necessity in the fall of man; and, in the next chapter, he declares, in energetic terms, that in order to salvation we must actually go through a process similar to that which our Saviour underwent. "Our old man must be crucified with Him," in order that "we may live with Him;" and, "as Christ was raised from the dead [*the state of fallen Adam, which is called death*] by the glory of God the Father, [*the impartation to the humanity of divine and holy principles of love and wisdom,*] so we must walk in the newness of life."

12. We have said thus much in answer to Mr. Fitz's question, "Does Paul mean that we reconcile ourselves?" We have shown that the reconciliation, or atonement, was wrought by "God in Christ;" and that the only way in which we can individually profit by it, is for each to "walk in newness of life," and to become "a new creature," and be "in Christ," whom we must faithfully "follow in the regeneration;" in short, that we must go through a process of temptation, combat, and victory—the same process as the Saviour himself underwent. "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God.*" An eminent father of the fourth century, Gregory Nazianzen, declares, that "to repair the ruins of the fall, the Almighty Word assumed human nature, and restored

it to the Divine image—that by *that human nature*, human nature *might* be purified.”

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

A reasonable man must acknowledge that evil will be the result of arrogating a knowledge which is denied to mankind generally. Mr. W. can see—others are blind. If we do not admit his absurdities, our ignorance is the cause! There is an *internal* sense. Mr. W. has spiritual spectacles, we presume, which enable him to make discoveries which are hidden from common eyes. The Scriptures inform us, that, “the *letter* killeth; the *Spirit* giveth life.” By the *letter*, we do not understand the impression made from types, with printer’s ink. Neither do we suppose that printer’s ink, impressed on paper, from leaden types, contain a “*Spirit* which giveth life.” By *letter*, we understand the ceremonial law, visible in its types, &c. By *Spirit*, the Spirit of God, communicating, through Christ, “life and immortality.”

We are taught in Mr. W.’s *second* paragraph, that the “*spiritual world*” is the “*mind of man*.” This is proved by four lines, with a *rhyme* at the end of them.

Mr. W.’s *third* paragraph has all the authority of his *positive assertions*. If a man shoots a sparrow with powder and shot, the sparrow’s fall is *spiritually* caused. The powder and shot existed prior to the shooting; consequently, before the powder and shot existed, the effect, the fall of the sparrow is not to be seen. We will compliment Mr. W., and call this *logic*. Relative to man’s fall, we never supposed his being created upright was the cause. But, that man was *made subject* to a state of vanity; or he could not have been subjected. Man did not possess wisdom, with all his uprightness, sufficient to preserve his uprightness. In plain English, If man had not been so constituted, by his Creator, as to afford opportunity, (amounting to *means*), to fall, he could not have fallen.

Mr. W. in his fifth paragraph contends, stoutly, “that apostolic testimony is in perfect harmony with his own.” He devotes a long paragraph to prove what we *never denied*. Sir, trifle no longer. The passage in question has nothing to do with any victory obtained over men; but a victory over *corruption and mortality*. It is 1 Cor. xv. 51—57. If the words “*we have obtained*,” are perfectly synonymous with the words “*God giveth*,” then “apostolic testimony is in perfect harmony” with Mr. W.’s. The reader will discover who is “driven to *miserable shifts*.”

Mr. W.’s sixth paragraph is rather petulant. Sir, you may as well be moderate. We asked you, without regard to the extent of God’s salvation, “What does Paul mean when he says, 2 Cor. v. 18, ‘And *all things* are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ?’ Does Paul mean that a *part* is of God? That we reconcile ourselves?’ &c. You, Sir, finding yourself in difficulty, endeavour to divert the mind of the reader, &c. You quote the connexion, and *alter* it. But you acknowledge that “every thing appertaining to such a re-

generated man is of God.” Very good, Sir, we are glad to see the truth from you at last. Now, Sir, for the “*if*.” You have taken the supply by the translators, and presented it to your readers for the text. “Therefore,” in consequence of what was previously declared, “if any man [*is*] in Christ a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.” Sir, if any man is not in Christ, he is not a new creature; old things have not become new. But, Sir, we read, “As in Adam all die, even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive.” How? Ans. Become *new* creatures. And, Sir, “all things are of God;” not any of Mr. Swedenborg. You, Sir, in a very exceptionable manner, ask, “Will his readers believe that there is no *if* in the above quotation?” We, Sir, have no doubt but it is very unpleasant to be mired in absurdity; and a bad matter is made worse, by so much kicking. Of the remainder of this paragraph, we say, please to *publish* that part of our reply which you allude to, in the same number of your Missionary which contains your remarks. But you have not done this. Accommodate your readers with *our* remarks; not with a *substitute*! Then, Sir, the reader can judge of our veracity. All we ask, is the “*fair play*,” the “*jewel*” you mentioned at the commencement of this controversy. “Fair play is a jewel!” Remember this, your own motto.

Mr. W.’s mode of expression, in his *seventh* paragraph, would authorize the supposition, that wisdom, light, and truth, was enclosed in a vessel, and in Mr. W.’s possession; who, occasionally, will condescend to turn a valve, and let a *ray of light* escape to benefit his inferiors. We inform Mr. W. that we have already learned, that *man* is reconciled to God, and not God to man. Also, that we believe the apostle, when he says, of the manner of the reconciliation, that it was by “not imputing their trespasses unto them.” And, Sir, “we pray you, in Christ’s stead, *be ye reconciled to God*.” More than this. We rejoice that the time is coming, when you will be reconciled; and that our prayer will be answered.

Of your *eighth* paragraph, wherein you define the world *world* to signify “*worldly principles*,” we are at a loss to conjecture what you can mean, unless it be, that God was in Christ reconciling worldly principles.

Your *ninth* paragraph appears to have effected little, except to “trouble the printer with *brackets*,” which, you inform us, are troublesome things.

Your next paragraph, may agree very well with Mr. Swedenborg’s mode of expressing opinions; but we would be glad to have you let out a few more rays of the light you spoke of.

We agree with you in your declaration in your *eleventh* paragraph, that our “*old man* must be crucified with him,” Christ. We believe, “the old man,” which is of the earth, will be put by, and that “God will make *all things new*.”

Of your last paragraph, we say, that we prefer the Scriptures to the opinions of “Gregory Nazianzen.” But, Sir, relative to what you have shown, we are of opinion that the Scriptures show much

more. They show, that "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." They show, that the life is immortality; and that instead of the "old man," which is of the earth, we shall all be changed, and rise in the heavenly image of our glorious Head and Redeemer.

(To be continued.)

From the Unitarian Miscellany.

NEW WORK PROPOSED BY RAMMOHUN ROY.

In reading the preface to Rammohun Roy's *Final Appeal to the Christian Public*, our attention was powerfully arrested by the following proposal for a monthly theological publication.

"As christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages, which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truths, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticisms, and to subject Unitarian as well as Trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

"For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis, and taking all the passages in that portion of scripture, which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one, and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the book of Exodus, and so on with all the books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

"If any one of the missionary gentlemen, for himself and in behalf of his fellow labourers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request that an Essay on the book of Genesis of the kind above intimated may be sent to me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits, not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge: should the missionary gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Christianity, towards this object; and also, that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it, by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy by short monthly publications may be attended with all the advantages which I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature, or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions, and such arguments as have no immediate connexion with the subject, and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never

allow ourselves, for a moment, to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation."

Whether this work will ever be commenced and prosecuted, we know not. There will doubtless be many obstacles to it; some of them arising unexpectedly, and some purposely created by interested men. But it is enough to increase our former admiration of this wonderful Hindoo, that he has announced such an undertaking. A periodical publication, devoted to the *exegesis*, as Professor Stuart would call it, of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, to be carried on by a Bramin of Hindostan, in the English language, at his own expense, with his own types, and at a press which is worked by his own countrymen! Who would have ventured to predict such a thing twenty years ago?

It has been for some time one of our most pleasing contemplations to mark the path of this man. It is a track of light in a dark sky. We cannot despair of the conversion of British India, at no very distant period, to a pure system of religion and morals, while we behold such a man as Rammohun Roy, labouring with all his heart and all his means, in the cause of reason, and knowledge, and truth.

From the (New-Haven) Columbian Register.

MISSIONARY MODESTY.

The "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," is about to petition Congress for aid and assistance, in christianizing the Indian tribes within our territories. (See Con. Journal, 21st Oct. 1823.) Considering the treatment which the Indians, as well as the United States, have received from the agents of that Society, this petition will manifest a degree of impudence not to be expected even in this age of impudence.

It is but a short time, since their agents at Elliot, by flattery and imposture, persuaded some chiefs of the Choctaw Indians to make over to them the annuity which that tribe receives from the government of the United States. The sum granted by those chiefs to the Missionary Society is 6000 dollars a year for sixteen years, and 5000 dollars for an additional year—making in the whole, *one hundred and one thousand dollars!!* This is *civilizing* the Indians at a great rate! (See letters from Missionaries, at Elliot, dated 12th of June, 1820; in the Panoplist.)

The conduct of the Indian chiefs, in this transaction, created such a tumult in the Choctaw tribe, that the government of the United States was obliged to interfere to quiet it; which could only be done by making them compensation for the robbery by a grant of lands. The following is an article of the treaty relating to that subject.

"ART. VIII. To remove any *discontent which may have arisen to the Choctaw nation* in consequence of 6000 dollars of their annuity having been appropriated and granted annually for sixteen years, *by some of the Chiefs*, for the support of their schools, the Commissioners of the United States oblige themselves, on the part of said States, to set apart an additional tract of good land, *for raising a fund equal to that given by said Chiefs*, so that the whole

of the annuity may remain in the nation and be divided among them." (See Acts, 2d Section, Sixteenth Congress, page 97.)

So it seems the government of the United States must pay the 101,000 dollars to this modest Missionary Society, who are not contented with that, but are about to ask for more.

A denial of the above grant from the Choctaws, we presume, will not be attempted, as it has been blazoned forth in most of our missionary prints, and adduced as an evidence of the success of the missionaries. After such a liberal donation from this tribe of Indians, it might be supposed that missionaries would treat them with kindness and hospitality. Instead of this, we find, from a late number of the *Missionary Herald*, that the Choctaw chiefs, in a public council, expressed dissatisfaction at what had been said about *parent's coming to see their children, and living on the missionaries*.—"This word," observes one of the chiefs, "may make some of us afraid to eat at your table, when we are hungry—Brother, throw away this word, (i. e. this sentence) and we agree to your talk at Mayhew." Mr. Kingsbury, the missionary, replied: "If that displease you, we will throw it away; as you say the Choctaws will not come to live on the missionaries at Elliot."

After this, we are told, Mr. Kingsbury "gave them a talk of considerable length, in which he clearly stated and answered all their objections, and obviated all their difficulties." A chief then "wished the missionaries and the Choctaws might shake hands, and go to bed good friends." "This," says the account, "was readily agreed to; and after uniting in thanksgiving and prayer to God, the Choctaws arranged themselves across the house, and as the brethren passed by, Mr. Kingsbury introduced them to our red friends—mentioned their occupation, and what they came to do for the Choctaws." Actions speak louder than words.

A NEW WAY TO EVANGELIZE.

The last Litchfield Eagle informs us that the Indians and whites at Cornwall are giving evidence of their faith by "loving one another." A young girl, (aged about 16) has married one of the Indians at the Missionary School. The connexions of the young woman are very respectable—that this unnatural connexion is the source of great unhappiness to all the relatives except the mother, who has embraced some strange ideas of the immense good which will result from this alliance. It is presumed that some of the clergy who have the watchful care of the Missionary school, have had a finger in the business. One of them has publicly advocated the *principle*, as the best mode of christianizing the savages. These things might be expected when we see people bestow more attention and caresses upon these blacks than upon the sons of respectable citizens.—We do not object to the plan of giving the Indian youth an English education; but we think it is carrying the matter too far, to marry them to the American fair; and no doubt the Apostle of the Gentiles would declare it "*unseemly*," was he

now upon the earth. Would the clergy who have advised to this marriage, consent that their daughters should marry Indians and retire to the forest, as a means of civilizing the wandering tribes? No, never! The clergy are too cunning—too well read in Don Quixote's theories, to spare their delicate daughters for any such greater good to any part of the human family. If an army of white men can be found who will go and marry the young *squaws*, we have no objections. But we doubt the propriety of giving the daughters of our citizens to the Indians, thus making them and their relatives both unhappy.—It is said that such is the enthusiasm in favor of the Indians and blacks at Cornwall, that the females treat the young men of the town with indifference, and ride and walk out, arm in arm with the tawny rivals—spend evenings with them—invite them to tea parties—correspond with them by letters, &c. What produces this state of things? Why, say the young ladies, the clergy pay great regard to these Missionary students, and should we be wanting in politeness? If this prove any thing, it proves how strong is the influence of the clergy, and how blind and thoughtless young women may be while governed by no higher motive than that influence. A highly approved poet says, "Go read your Bible to be wise." *N. H. Register.*

From the (Portland) Christian Intelligencer.

MAN AN INFINITE BEING.

MR. EDITOR—One of the most singular arguments for the infinity of future punishment, that has come under my observation, I met with a while since, in a pamphlet by a Mr. Merritt of the Methodist persuasion. I saw the work but a few moments, and therefore am not able to quote verbatim, but the substance of his reasoning was this. He says the Universalists argue, that man is a finite creature; that a finite creature cannot perform an infinite act; that sin is the act of man, and of course finite. Therefore, as the sins of men do not merit it, an infinite punishment would be disproportionate and unjust. God will not, therefore, inflict on men an infinite punishment. This reasoning he admits to be conclusive, provided the premise, viz. the finitude of the creature, is correct. But he contends that man, in a proper sense, is an infinite being.—Though not a natural one, this certainly is a very great artificial curiosity. He does not, however, consider man to be infinite in the degree of his being, but in the duration of it. Man, he says, is an immortal being, and therefore, in this sense, an infinite one, who may deserve and receive infinite punishment from God. Now, as this reasoning may appear plausible, at least, to a superficial observer, I will offer a remark or two upon it. 1. Man in the constitution in which he sins, is not an immortal, but a mortal creature. God only hath immortality. 1 Tim. vi. 16. He only, therefore, can impart it. But man, to possess and enjoy endless life, must put off mortality, and put on immortality. 1 Cor. xv. 53. It is a blessing for which we are seeking in the present state. Rom. ii. 7. And I have no recollection that the Scriptures mention a

single instance of one who sinned after he had put on immortality. Mr. Merritt's immortal sinner is therefore, merely imaginary, and his reasoning, though sincere, is destitute of validity.

2 The Bible every where represents sinners as mortal and momentary creatures. They are "of few days." Their, "life is as a shadow and continueth not." A little time, and the places which knew them, will know them no more. Is it not absurd, to call dying mortals of a day, never-dying immortals? Should this subject be thought to require further notice, it is hoped that some of your correspondents, who have leisure, will feel inclined to pursue it. S. S.

"THE LIBERAL SOUL SHALL BE MADE FAT."

The spacious and commodious House erected the past season, by the Second Society of United Christian Friends, on the corner of Prince and Orange streets, the Basement story of which is occupied every Sabbath, and every Thursday in the evening, will be finished in the course of the Spring, with the assistance of the liberal friends of truth, in a plain, substantial, and *economical* manner.

We invite the attention of the public to the following—While the Houses *professedly* erected for the worship of God, the promulgation of truth, and the instruction of mankind, almost without exception, are under the control of sectarians, who *usurp* authority over the consciences of men, and exclude from their Houses of worship, all teachers who differ from them in sentiment; this House is not only *professedly*, but will be *practically* engaged for the worship of God, in Christian charity, even for those whom God, in his wise providence, has permitted, for a time, to think and speak differently from the Society who have erected the House. Therefore, while hundreds of thousands of dollars are collected to build and maintain Houses of worship, for the *exclusive* privilege of *sectarians*, is it not reasonable to expect some efforts to be made, and a disposition to be manifested, by the public in this enlightened day, favourable to liberality, candour, and Christian charity? We trust the appeal to liberal, candid men, cannot be made in vain. To such, we say, To the liberal, show yourselves *liberal*. Advance, as much as in you lies, the cause of Truth, which should be the cause of the world. And afford, by every laudable facility, an opportunity for Truth, armed only with *argument* and *testimony*, to triumph over the monster error, who brandishes the unhallowed weapons of slander, detraction, and persecution; and is intrenched behind the ramparts of bigotry, pride and intolerance.

The following is a copy of a resolution of the Second Society of United Christian Friends:

At a special meeting of the "Second Society of United Christian Friends in the city of New-York," Monday evening, June 16, 1823, it was resolved unanimously, that on application from clergymen of regular standing, correct and Christian deportment, differing from this Society in their faith, liberty shall be granted and the house opened for

their accommodation, at reasonable seasons, when the house shall be unoccupied by the Society who shall stately worship in that place. And the Society express their unqualified opinion, that they are in duty bound to afford an opportunity to clergymen of a different faith, to defend their own principles, and to point out any errors they may conceive to be cherished by this Society.

PUBLIUS LENTULUS'S LETTER.

"There appeared in these our days, a man of great virtue, named Jesus Christ, who is yet living among us, and of the Gentiles is accepted as a prophet of truth, but by his own disciples called the *Son of God*. He raiseth the dead, and cureth all manner of diseases. A man of stature somewhat tall, and comely, with a very reverend countenance, such as the beholders may both *love and fear*; his hair is of the colour of a filbert full ripe, and plain almost down to his ears, but from his ears downwards, somewhat curled, more orient of colour, and waving about his shoulders. In the midst of his head goeth a seam or partition of his hair, after the manner of the Nazarites; his forehead very plain and smooth: his face without spot or wrinkle, beautified with comely red; his nose and mouth so formed as nothing can be reprehended; his beard somewhat thick, and agreeable in colour to the hair of his head, not of any great length, but forked in the midst; of an innocent, mature look; his eyes grey, clear, and quick. In reproving, he is terrible; in admonishing, courteous and fair spoken; pleasant in speech, mixed with gravity. It cannot be remembered that any have seen him laugh, but many have seen him weep. In proportion of body, well shaped and straight; his hands and arms right delectable to behold; in speaking very temperate, modest and wise. A man for singular beauty, surpassing the children of men."

NEWS FROM RAHWAY.

The friends of truth in Rahway, (N. J.) have undertaken to erect a Meeting House, for the worship of the God who "is the Saviour of all men." We are assured that the building will commence immediately; and that from the zeal manifested on the occasion, no doubt exists of its being prosecuted to completion, without delay. The house to be of the dimensions of 28 by 42 feet. This house, when erected, will be open for the accommodation of Christians of all denominations; and will, in the proper sense of the term, be a *free Church*. It is understood, that arrangements are contemplated to be made, to secure the occasional labours of preachers of "the word of truth, the Gospel of your *salvation*."

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—ISA. ix. 6.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half past 6 o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1824.

NO. 42.

PARABLE—THE WHEAT AND TARES.

Matthew xiii. 36-43.

"Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house; and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

COMMENT.

Agreeably to our promise, we now offer a comment on this parable, which is considered, by some, to prove future punishment. We have selected the Saviour's declaration to his disciples. It has been said, that the part we have quoted, is not the *parable*, but the *explanation* of the parable. It is the explanation that we want. The reader can turn to his Bible and read the connexion. The question then is, What is the true import of the Saviour's declaration to his disciples, of the parable? The words he used have a meaning; What do they import? Shall we resort to human tradition, systems and creeds, for authority; or shall we confine ourselves to the Scriptures? We think the latter course the most advisable, and shall therefore go to the Scriptures alone for information.

The errors which have been propagated, and predicated on this passage, we have nothing to do with. The reader can prefer truth, if he is so disposed; and error is abroad in great plenty. As most people are acquainted with the misconstructions of the passage, it is not necessary to repeat them.

It may be proper, however, to mention, that the orthodox view of the parable, makes the kingdom *begin* at the very time that the Scriptures declare to be the *end*; at the resurrection of man to life and immortality, when the kingdom is represented as being delivered up to the Father, that "God may be all in all." The end; that is the purpose of God, in man's redemption will then be accomplished, through the Mediator, Christ, whose Mediatorial Kingdom and judgment will be finished. "For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed, *death*." All things are spoken of as being *subdued* unto him; made to conform to his law of *love*. (See 1 Cor. xv.) The kingdom of Christ commenced immediately when the

harvest was reaped, and the old dispensation cleared away.

We request the reader to remember, that the "kingdom of heaven," or "*reign of God*," is that which is spoken of, and the parable is used to illustrate this kingdom or reign, by introducing similes, and likening or comparing the kingdom or reign, to them. That is, to the things spoken of. Thus says the Saviour, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field." And we shall find, in the sequel, that it is likened unto a man who will not permit any but *good* seed, to remain in his field. The reverse of the kingdom or reign of God, may be likened unto a man who sowed *bad* seed in a field, and caused it to remain there, to the continual detriment of the field. But, reader, "the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed *good* seed in his field." It is the *man's* field; he *owns* the soil he cultivates. "But while men slept, his [the man's, the owner's] enemy came [who did not own an inch of the ground,] and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way," &c. Reader, are you a tiller of the ground? Do you own a field? What would you do, if, after you have sown your field with wheat, an enemy should come and sow tares, or weeds? Would you destroy the *field*, if you had power so to do? We think not. Neither will God in his reign over men, destroy them.

Mankind are the field. Christ says, "The *field* is the *world*." The very *world* the Scriptures assure us God loved, and Christ came to save. For it is the same word in the original, which is rendered world in all these passages. In harmony with the Scriptures, are the best human authorities, who define the word *kosmos*, rendered world, to signify *homines universi*, *mankind universally*. This is the field. What was sown in it? The parable says, wheat. Christ says, "the good seed are the children of the kingdom." Who sowed the good seed? Ans. The Son of man. Who is he? Ans. Christ. "The tares are the children of the *wicked*." Who? Why, we will suppose the devil, for it is said, he *sowed them*. What has the devil to do with the field, mankind? Ans. Nothing more than to sow tares in them. What is the Son of man represented as doing with the field, mankind? Ans. Sowing good seed in them, in *his* field. Does the sowing weeds in another man's field, give the sower a title to the field, and is the field from that time his property? By no means. But the weeds may be considered as his children, as he has caused them, and the field is characterized, for the time being, with whatever it produces. As men say, A field of wheat;

A field of rye—or, if you please, a field of tares or weeds. So mankind are characterized as children of the wicked, or devil. As we read, “If any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not of him;” Christ. Not “none of his.” In like manner Christ told the rebellious Jews, “Ye are of *your father the devil*.” How? Because ye do *his works*. What are his works? Ans. Tares. The tares, then, constitute, in a qualified sense, all who receive and cherish them, the children of the father, or sower of the tares, the devil. Our venerable mother Eve was a part of the field. The enemy came, and sowed his tares. We think they must have taken root, and yielded a plentiful crop, for the sower has not yet been in want of seed.

We must therefore conclude, that the good seed constitutes those who receive and cherish it, the children of the kingdom. The kingdom is “righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.” For God’s reign is spiritual, it is merciful, or righteous, and produces joy in all who know him, and discern his judgments. They are begotten by the seed, as children of the kingdom. James i. 18, says, “Of his own will begat he us with the *word of truth*, that we should be a kind of *first-fruits* of his creatures.” The word of truth is the seed. Those in whom the word of truth grows, are distinguished as *fruits*. Children are considered as *fruit*, by the prophet. The word children and fruit, are thus used as convertible terms.

To consider the *persons*, who are called children of the kingdom, and children of the wicked, to be the *seed*, that is spoken of, as sown by the Son of man, and by the enemy; the devil, involves the strange conclusion that the devil is the creator of man; and destroys the field. More than this. The field is declared the property of the Son of man; but the devil is the owner, if he is the creator of the field. We consider the field to be mankind. We have proved this. Any other construction or understanding of the field, which is declared to be the *world*, will produce absurdity and confusion.

The reader will please to remember, that God always governs and controls the universe, according to his pleasure, in reference to his purpose of love and mercy. At the time when the parable was spoken, a new era was about to dawn upon mankind. “The Father committed all judgment unto the Son.” The dispensation, *aionos*, or age of the ceremonial law, whose types and shadows were about to be rendered useless by the coming and government of the Antitype, was drawing to a close. The commencement of a new dispensation, or display of God’s judgments, and the conclusion of the old, are among the subjects treated of in the parable. Thus the Saviour says, “The harvest is the end of the [*aionos*] world.” Not *kosmos*, mankind. “The reapers are the angels.” That is, the messengers of the new testament, or Gospel. The word *aggeloi*, rendered *angels*, properly signifies *messengers*, and is thus translated in James ii. 25.

The Saviour next introduces the figure of the burning of useless or pernicious weeds; saying, “As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this [*aionos*]

world.” When the time of harvest arrives, the husbandman clears his field. He destroys that which is useless and pernicious, and preserves the grain, &c. The Saviour introduces this simile to illustrate his government; as Mediator, in effecting the reconciliation of man, according to the purpose of the Father. But we have seen, that the party is characterized by the seed, whether it be the good seed, or the tares. We think we must consider the tares to be altogether a separate and different plant; and not, as some have supposed, the chaff which encloses the grain. Every thing appertaining to the wheat stalk, grows from the seed which produces the wheat. Every thing appertaining to the tares, or weeds, is the progeny of the enemy’s seed. The tares therefore, can never be converted into wheat; nor the wheat, by any process, degenerate and become tares. The field which receives the various seeds, whether of wheat or tares, may have “stony places,” the seed may “fall by the way side,” or it may fall “among thorns,” &c. notwithstanding which, the distinction must be kept up between the field, the wheat, and the tares. The tares are bound in bundles, by themselves; the wheat is gathered separate, and housed. “So shall it be in the end of this world;” this age.

The distinction observed by the agriculturalist, is not greater than that which Christ made, in the end of the Mosaic economy. The Jews and disciples of Christ grew together, undistinguished by any particular signs of approbation or disapprobation, from the great Lord of the harvest, until the harvest was gathered. The Jews could point to the gilded spires of the temple, and send the smoke of their sacrifices, in clouds, to heaven, while the disciples of Christ were undistinguished save by the approbation of their humble and despised Master. The disciples, in their zeal, would have destroyed the tares; and on one occasion would have called fire from heaven to burn their enemies. But they knew not what spirit they were of.

The Saviour connects the offence and the offender. That is, the tares and the receiver. “They shall gather out of his kingdom all *things* that offend, and *them* which *do* iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

The end of the Mosaic economy, and the introduction of the Gospel, the New-Jerusalem, is spoken of by the prophet Joel iii. 13-16. “Put ye in the sickle, for the *harvest is ripe*: come get ye down; for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord *will be* the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel.” (See Jere. viii. 19-22.) Isa. xvii. 4, 5, speaks of the same event. “And in that day it shall come to pass, *that* the glory of Jacob shall be made thin, and the fatness of his flesh shall wax lean. And it shall be as when the *harvest man* gathereth the corn,” &c.

God's judgments upon Babylon are spoken of as a harvest, Jere. li. 33. "For thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; The daughter of Babylon is like a threshing floor, it is time to thresh her; yet a little while, and the time of her *harvest* shall come." Peter, Acts ii. 14-21, speaks of the prophecy of Joel, as having its fulfilment in that day. The reader is also referred to Rev. xiv. 14-20, for additional testimony, and requested to observe the order of the events which follow, as related in subsequent chapters. The winding up, or end of the dispensation of types, is therefore fitly compared to a *harvest*, when the field is cleared, and prepared for a new crop. Thus mankind are prepared for the gospel kingdom, or New-Jerusalem, and old Jerusalem is reaped, gathered out of the way, to make room for the new. The field will bear fruit unto righteousness. The Great Husbandman will cultivate the soil, and write his law where the noxious principles of evil once grew in poisonous luxuriance. The field will be cleared in the harvest, and the weeds destroyed root and branch. In proof of this we shall produce the most unquestionable testimony, in illustration of the *furnace*, into which the tares are cast to be burned. And we again request the reader to remember, that however the field may be characterized by the produce which it bears, the field and the crop are two things.

The harvest is in accordance with God's merciful purpose to redeem man out of all his distresses.—To purge him from all his iniquities. To cleanse him from all his sins. The *tares* are the source of man's misery. Perpetuate them, and man is destroyed for ever. Destroy them, and man, the field, is restored, and will become the vineyard of the Lord; His pleasant plant. "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap *their* hands. Instead of the *thorn* [which chokes the word] shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." (Isa. lv.) Thus God's word shall triumph. "Is not my word as a *fire*?" "Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the *words of my mouth*." (Hosea vi. 5.) The purpose of God is more fully set forth by Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 11-15. "For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."—Nothing short of infidelity, itself, can deny the consequence declared in this passage, which, however man may lose of his own inventions, will be glorious in the end, and restore him, purged of all sin and iniquity. This is God's purpose. Will it be accom-

plished? To prove that man, the field, will be cleansed in the furnace, the fire, we invite the reader to examine the following passages; requesting him to remember, that Scripture is the best expositor of Scripture.

We read Deut. iv. 20, of the bondage in Egypt, which the Israelites endured, and which is compared to an iron furnace. The mode of expression is used 1 Kings viii. 51; Jere. xi. 4. But to put the question at rest, we have positive testimony that *Jerusalem* is the furnace; not a future and endless hell. How men professing great devotion to truth, and respect for the Scriptures, can slight their testimony, and refuse to give their assent to the positive and unequivocal declarations of God's prophets, is to us very astonishing. But it is so. Isa. xxxi. 9, declares, of God, "Whose *fire is in Zion*, and his *furnace* [where? In a future hell? No!] in *Jerusalem*." Reader, we do not ask you to believe our assertion; but to believe *God's* prophet. Again; Isa. xlviii. 10, 11. "Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the *furnace* of affliction. For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should *my name* be polluted? and I will not give my glory unto another." This is strong language. God will effect his purpose. God declares to the amount, that His honour or glory is pledged "to redeem Israel from all his iniquities."

Again; Although the testimony already quoted is sufficient to satisfy an unprejudiced mind, (if such could be found,) we have testimony as clear as the sun at noonday, to prove the truth of our proposition. Here it is—Ezek. xxii. 17-22. "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are *even* the dross of silver. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather *you* in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave *you there*, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." The *house of Israel* are spoken of, the Jews. What is to be the consequence of being gathered in the *furnace*, which is Jerusalem? Ans. Isa. i. 25, "And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely *purge away thy dross*, and take away *all thy tin*." The prophet David prayed, (in faith, we trust,) for the accomplishment of God's purpose, Ps. lxxix. 9. "Help us, O God of our salvation, *for the glory of thy name*; and deliver us, and *purge away our sin*, for *thy name's sake*." The prophet Malachi iii. 1-3, speaks of the same event. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his

temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness." In the figurative language of the parable, the house of Israel is represented as tares bound in bundles, because they were enclosed in walls, and surrounded by the Roman army, in such a manner as to make escape impossible. The tares, the children of the wicked, or Jews, are spoken of by the prophet Ezek. xxxvii. and the "house of Israel" compared to *dry bones*, impotent and dead; a corresponding figure with dross, which is useless. The question is asked—"Son of man, can these *bones live*?" How harmonious is God's testimony, by all his holy prophets! Hear the triumphant truth—"Behold, O my people, *I will open your graves*," &c. "and ye shall know that I am the Lord;" When? Ans. "When *I have opened your graves*," &c. "and *put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live*."

God's Spirit is love, for "GOD IS LOVE." The Saviour's veracity is pledged, saying, Matt. v. 17, 18. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily, I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Let the unbeliever object, that the *threatenings* of the law must be fulfilled. We ask, "Is the law against the promises of God?" The penalty of the law is death. Not endless misery. And we rejoice to add, "that as sin has reigned unto *death* [not unto an endless hell,] even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. v.) "The law of the Lord *is perfect*, [not because its penalty is death, but in] *converting* the soul: the testimony of the Lord *is sure*, [How? Sure to damn the sinner endlessly? No! but in] *making wise the simple*." (Psa. xix. 7.) Therefore, the law that will not convert the soul, is not perfect. The testimony that will not make the simple wise, is not sure. God's law requires supreme love to Him, and to love our neighbour as ourselves. It shall be fulfilled. It shall be written in every heart. A glorious consummation!

But we read, "God hath a controversy with his people." The law shall be fulfilled. Every tittle of it. The transgressors shall die. Isa. v. 1-7, and 24. "Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill: and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I

have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? And now, go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard; I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down: and I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briars and thorns; I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. For the vineyard of the LORD of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant: and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry. Therefore, as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the LORD of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."

Shall the transgressors *die*? Shall they not be made alive? Hear the word of the Lord. "See now that I, *even I, am he*, and there is no god with me: I kill, and *I make alive*; I wound, and *I heal*: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. For the Lord shall judge his people, and repent himself for his servants; when he seeth that *their power is gone, and there is none shut up or left*." Deut. xxxii. 36, 39.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—Being a constant subscriber and reader of the Gospel Herald, I feel anxious to see it rendered useful and prosperous. Therefore, I take the liberty to express my opinion, respecting some of the essays which you have selected to fill the pages of the present volume. Though I am entertained and instructed by the writings of some of your correspondents, as well as by your own; yet I must say, that I am heartily tired of your prolix controversy with Mr. Woodworth, and but little entertained in the perusal of Mr. Ruffner's discourse; and I hope that my patience will not be tried again with similar uninteresting matter. And I have heard several other subscribers complain of these essays, and say that they would discontinue their patronage, if they are to be treated with such dry stuff.

The 3d volume was far more interesting than the present one. For my part, I should be much pleased to see frequent biographical sketches of the lives of Rely, Murray, Winchester, and others. Also, a list of churches or societies who profess the belief of the universal restoration, with the names of the towns, counties, and states, where they are situated; the names of the preachers, &c. with the date of the organization of the societies, &c. &c. Such selections would be read with avidity and increase your patronage, in my humble opinion.

A historical sketch of the rise and increase of Universalism would be very acceptable. A FRIEND.

New-York, Feb. 14, 1824.

REMARKS.

The old adage, "That which is one man's meat, is another man's poison," may apply on the present occasion. Likewise the "Fable of the Old Man,

his Son, and the Ass." For ourselves, we are willing the public, or any portion of the public, shall express and cherish sentiments of approbation, to us ward;—they have our permission to cherish and express the reverse, if they think proper. Our "Friend" has expressed his sentiments. We have expressed ours. "We are even." We assure him, that we would not withhold the paper from him on this account; and why should he withdraw his patronage on a similar one? If the editor of this paper studied his *pecuniary* profit, and valued the *smiles*, the *friendly nods*, and *complacent winks*, of mankind at large, he would not be found *tugging at the condemned car of truth*. IMPARTIALITY, which is almost banished from the religious world, has been our only watchword. We may have erred a variety of ways; (and who is *perfect*?) but, let what will be subtracted from the quantum of our modest pretensions, the word IMPARTIAL will be left.

There is our good and worthy friend, Mr. Woodworth, he may be a *little dry*, at times, but we hope, ere long, to *moisten him* with the gentle showers of truth. Besides, Mr. Woodworth is in hope yet; as he says, in the last Number of his Missionary, that "he has already *opened the eyes* of many of our friends." Surely, our Friend would not abridge the useful labours of this *great Optician*!

We wish Mr. Ruffner's Discourse had been a little better. But, as we had no hand in composing it, we are not justly censurable for its want of merit. Some of our Subscribers expressed their approbation of publishing it, and of our reply, in a letter of thanks; which will do for an offset to the complaint of our Friend.

Our "Third Volume," as our Friend observes, "was," perhaps, "far more interesting than the present one." Alas! life is but a dream. Man is an evanescent creature; and "fades as the leaf." Humiliating as the reflection must be, our correspondents, as well as ourselves, may be sinking into dotage. Ah, well, let us bear it cheerily; and not, like the Bishop of Toledo, banish our monitor for telling the truth.

Will our Friend furnish us correct "Biographical sketches of the lives of Rely, Murray, Winchester, and others?" If he will, we will publish them. "A Historical sketch of the rise and increase of Universalism," would probably include much of the former. "The General Convention of Universalists," nearly three years ago, chose a Committee for this very purpose, who, with all their means and opportunities, have not yet been able to collect the information necessary to such an undertaking. Will our Friend be willing to vouch for the truth and correctness of our "Biographical Sketches," &c. if we will undertake the task, without the *necessary* information, or present means of obtaining it? No! we think not. We can write a romance, or a novel, and entitle it "Biographical Sketches," &c. And we are of opinion that if all the History and Biography, now extant, were properly labelled in the back, the lovers of fiction would be treated with a new repast.

The names of preachers, location of societies, date of organization, names of towns, counties, and states, with all the formula thereunto appertaining, might be interesting to many. But we have tried in vain to obtain the necessary information, &c. "The General Convention," only, can obtain this information; and we hope will turn their attention to it, and publish an Annual Register of the number, state, and progress of societies, &c. &c.

On the whole, we are disposed to thank our correspondent for his hints and freedom. If we are at any time culpable, a little wholesome reproof will be like medicine. If we do not need it, our measure of health will guard us from any injury the otherwise nauseating draught might occasion.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—A short time since, I happened to be conversing with a preacher of the Methodist persuasion, who appeared to be almost, if not entirely, divested of religious intolerance. During our interview, he related the following dialogue, which occurred in his presence, in this city, about three years ago, between a Universalist and a Calvinist. If you think it worthy of notice, I should be pleased to see the substance of it in the Gospel Herald. E.

DIALOGUE, &c.

Universalist. Do you believe that God *foreordained* whatsoever comes to pass?

Calvinist. Yes.

U. Does he foreordain it according to his *own will*?

C. Most certainly.

U. Does every event come to pass *agreeably* to God's will or foreordination?

C. Yes; or rather, God permits it so to be, for the fulfilment of certain wise purposes.

U. Then do you believe that every man does the *will* of God?

C. Yes—in a certain sense, or so far as he obeys the dictates of a good conscience.

U. Do you believe that God will punish any man for doing the *will* of his Creator and Preserver?

C. I must acknowledge that I am not fond of disputing on intricate subjects, which profit but little. I am in haste, and must bid you farewell.

New-Orleans, 7th Jan. 1824.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Dear Sir—I have the pleasure to communicate to you an account of the commencement and progress of truth in this city. About the 20th Dec. Mr. D. M. Cole arrived among us, from the upper country, and gave notice that he would deliver a discourse on universal salvation the following Sabbath, in the Market-house; the *first* time the glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people, has been proclaimed in this city; and not without its consequent opposition and success. The Mayor issued his mandate, that if Mr. Cole attempted to preach in that public manner, he would be fined and *imprisoned*. Mr. Cole delivered his message of the purpose and love of God towards his children. The officers came too late to arrest him;—the truth

had been proclaimed;—the proclaimer found friends; though before entirely unknown to any person favourable to the truth.

A convenient house was procured for the next Sabbath. The Mayor interfered, and ordered the owner not to open his doors, or suffer preaching in his house; and that Mr. Cole would be arrested if he attempted to preach, except on board some vessel in the river. We accordingly went on board a vessel. This opposition caused inquiry into the merits of the cause, and the conduct of the authority. A house was again procured, and notice given for the next Sabbath; when we were allowed to worship God according to the dictates of our *own* understandings, without molestation or interruption. Great numbers attended, and many brethren, before unknown to each other, from different parts of our country, met together, and united in the worship of "the God of the whole earth."

Meetings on the Sabbath have been regularly called, and we have had preaching, though Mr. Cole has left us; and a subscription started for the *building of a house*. Mr. Cole is to return and preach for us the next winter. The people here, through the blessing of God, will not, in future, be entirely destitute of the word of life, the "glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

Yours in the faith of the salvation of all through the merits of a Redeemer. NATHL. S. ROSE.

REMARKS.

The above is a confirmation of our declaration, that the truth is more offensive to mankind than error. That falsehood will find ready advocates, and many friends. The Hon. Mayor of New-Orleans is ignorant, and his conduct similar to the Jews of old. However, it is astonishing that a city of the size and importance of New-Orleans, should elect a man for Chief Magistrate, so notoriously ignorant of the Constitution of the United States. We take the liberty of informing this gentleman, that if he continues his opposition, and should have the effrontery to disturb the freemen of America in their worship, he may thank them for their *lenity*, if he is not made an example of; his "little brief authority," and "civick honours," to the contrary notwithstanding.

Query. Which has the greater tendency to demoralize the good people of New-Orleans; the preaching that "God is the Saviour of *all* men, especially those that believe," or *theatrical* exhibitions on the Sabbath?

We never knew a more full illustration of the truth of our Saviour's observation, relative to "straining at a gnat, and *swallowing a camel*."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—On Tuesday evening, (last week) at a meeting of "The Society for the Investigation of Gospel truth;" I heard a passage of Scripture read and some few remarks made upon it, the proper understanding of which, I have long wished to have. I will be candid and say, that since it first came particularly under my notice, I have had less regard for the book containing it.

The passage alluded to, is found, Isaiah vii. 1-16, inclusive, which I once considered a most prominent prophecy of the coming of Jesus Christ; my ideas are now consonant with those of the Moderator, that it has no reference to Jesus Christ whatever; but that Isaiah had reference to a child of his own.

It was also said, that Isaiah was *sent* to comfort the king of Judah, whose "heart was moved," and "the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved by the wind." It appears a confederate army was marching against Ahaz, (with the intention of attacking, dethroning, and placing on the throne of Ahaz, another king, "even the son of Tabeal,") and that Isaiah was sent to comfort him, and among other things, says to him, "Thus saith the LORD God, it shall *not stand*, neither shall it *come to pass*;" but if we look at 2 Chron. xxviii. 1-8, inclusive, we find that which Isaiah had said, the LORD God had said, should *not* come to pass, *did* come to pass!

I have said my regard is not so great for the book containing the above passages, as it once was. That is, I once considered it to be the *word of God*; but if I know myself, I am a firm believer in the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, and therefore cannot conscientiously believe, that God ever said that any thing should *not* come to pass, and afterwards suffered the *same* thing to come to pass. It necessarily follows, that Isaiah told king Ahaz, that which God had never said.

Your remarks on the above passages, may possibly open my eyes, if I am in an error; and will be gratifying to several of your readers, with whom I have talked on the subject. L.

New-York, Feb. 19, 1824.

ANSWER.

When we opened and read the above communication, we concluded, that, *if* our correspondent, L, was correct, the prophet Isaiah would remain unimpeached, in our estimation; and his declaration stand the test. For the books of Chronicles, or records of events, kept by the kings of Israel and Judah, that is, under their control, would be liable to adulteration or alteration, from causes which would not exist in reference to the prophecies. We, however, always find, that the Old Book, shines the brighter the harder it is rubbed. Our correspondent, L., is mistaken, not the book.

The reader will learn, by turning to Isa. vii. 1-16, that the Israelites with Peka their king, and the Syrians with Rezin their king, were confederate, and made war against Ahaz, king of Judah. Isaiah the prophet was sent, by the LORD, to Ahaz, king of Judah, to console him; who assured Ahaz, "Thus saith the LORD God, It shall *not stand*, neither shall it *come to pass*," &c. What shall *not stand*? What shall *not come to pass*? Ans. verse 6, "Let us make a breach therein for us, and *set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal*." This was the counsel which Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah took against Judah; and the prophet says, "Thus saith the LORD God, *It shall not stand*, neither shall it *come to pass*." Now we ask, *Did it*

stand? *Did* it come to pass? L. says, "If we look at 2 Chron. xxviii. 1-8, inclusive, we find that which Isaiah had said, the LORD God had said, should *not* come to pass, *did* come to pass!" We have looked, and looked in vain, for this. So far from the son of Tabeal being raised to Ahaz's throne, and he destroyed, we are assured in this very chapter, that Ahaz reigned king of Judah, until his death; when Hezekiah, his son, peaceably succeeded him! It is true, that Pekah, king of Israel, with his allies, made the attempt; and slew 120,000 men; they carried away 200,000 captives; and were met by a prophet, who remonstrated with Pekah; when the captives were treated with presents, and sent back to their homes and firesides.

Our correspondent must have read the passages in question, in a very superficial manner. He will find, on examining them, that there is no discrepancy; that the testimony is true, and the prophet a man of God, in truth and verity. Therefore, the chapter brought by L. to disprove Isaiah's declaration, *confirms it*, in the most unequivocal manner.

◆

From the Christian Repository.

CHARACTER OF ELHANAN WINCHESTER.

I shall be pardoned the attempt of a very feeble delineation of the character which I have always admired, loved and venerated. Feeble indeed, it must be, as the original was such as not often arrests the attention of mankind, yet I shall be satisfied, if able to sketch an outline strictly comporting with truth, and descriptive of only the most predominant features of him "whose praise was in all our churches."

Mr. Winchester was born at Brookline, (Mass.) in the year 1750. It has been asserted that no peculiar traits of genius marked the first years of juvenile life. But as he approached manhood, when the mental powers began to expand, the native talents of a mind which was afterwards to astonish mankind, began to exhibit themselves. His powers of memory were soon observable. His natural seriousness and predisposition to the concerns of religion were perceived, and at a very early age, say about nineteen, he commenced preaching as an itinerant Baptist. His contemporaries and associates regarded him as a young man of great promise, who would shortly become a "burning and shining light," in which they and their fellow christians should greatly "rejoice." Already he preached with a zeal, a pathos and animation rarely seen in others. His travels and labours soon extended from Vermont to South Carolina. In this enlarged space of country, hundreds, perhaps thousands were awakened to a serious view of the importance of religion, and to this day, many who did not keep pace with him in his mental travel, nor partake of the enlargement of his views of "the great salvation," still acknowledge Mr. W. as the instrument of their "turning from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

While at the southward, he received the first impression favourable to Universal Grace. Shortly, he sailed for England, where he tarried about nine

years, preaching and writing much. In London he was well received—and in that city he delivered and published his lectures on the prophecies, with many other subordinate works, in illustration and support of the doctrine of the Restoration. On his return to America, which was about the year 1793, he was received with a high degree of satisfaction by such as had imbibed his sentiments, and even by many who did not subscribe to them. He was heard with attention by most classes of Christians, and it was very rare that the meeting-houses of every denomination were not opened to him, and crowded with attentive and admiring auditors.

The various orders of clergy in the United States associated with him, as with a man from whom they must have derived pleasure and profit. His extensive reading, his enlarged acquaintance with mankind, the fund of knowledge, stored in a memory bordering upon intuition, rendered his society interesting and instructive to all descriptions of men. But his urbanity, and benevolence which glowed in his bosom, his simple unaffected manners, rendered his conversation doubly interesting. Mr. W. had none of that imposing haughtiness, which lays humble inquiry under a painful restraint, nothing of that asperity of mind which often wounds the feelings of an opponent, and silences without convincing him. He respected the tender feelings of all Christians, was charitable to their ignorance and absurdity, and treated with "meekness those who opposed themselves" to what he considered the truth of the Gospel. His literary acquirements were by no means of a limited or superficial nature. With Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, he had an acquaintance, in which he was excelled by few; and he was able to preach intelligibly in the French language. The warmth of his feeling with which he contemplated religion, the deep and solemn interest which he took in all its concerns, and his habit of piety, which had "grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength," gave a pathos to his public discourses, which awakened and sustained the attention of the crowd who waited on his ministry; and though some might think him an enthusiast, yet his was not the enthusiasm that distracts the mind, confounds the ideas, or disgusts the taste. Under his impressive preaching, ridicule felt disarmed of half her weapons, and wit, which sometimes sports with sacred things, in his presence, tacitly confessed the object above her reach.

E. T.

◆

From the (Philadelphia) Reformer.

PAUPERISM IN NEW-YORK.

It is stated in the *Fourth Annual Report of the Managers of the Society at New-York for the prevention of Pauperism*, that several boys have been sent to the penitentiary as vagrants, and are not confined there as convicts. "This part of them," the Managers observe, "would at once be discharged, had they parents, guardians, friends, employment, or the visible means of a livelihood; but in the providence of God, having neither father nor mother, and being cast upon the inclement world, friendless and destitute, unoffending and young;

they have been gathered by the cold arms of the law, and thrust into a prison filled with miscreants of every description—there to imbibe the principles and habits of their future course—there to unfold their immortal powers, in an atmosphere polluted with crime! because these youths have in their infancy been abandoned by the hand that should have protected them!"

We think these youths of our own country are much fitter objects of commiseration and charity, for our numerous benevolent associations, than the natives of Hindostan, or the rangers of the wilderness. But charity, to make a noise in the world, must be carried on abroad.



ANOTHER VICTIM

To the Doctrine of Endless Torture.

A respectable matron in this city, the present week, threw her infant into a cistern of water, and jumped in herself. The lamentable story is soon told. She was a member of a church, in this city, where the doctrine of ENDLESS MISERY is proclaimed. The wretched woman believed it—reason fled—in a moment of unutterable horror, she fell a sacrifice to the doctrine of Devils!

Christ declares, (John x. 9. 10.) "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Query. *What door did this unfortunate woman enter at? Alas! a door where no pasture could be found. A door, which led to death.*

Note—We omit the name of the lamented victim. It is sufficient to relate the fact. The blood of these victims will be required. Let the popular destroyers consider.

THE FORCE OF EDUCATION.

I now come to make it evident, *that mankind universally, according to the Scriptures, shall, in the final result of things, be happy.* And I am in no strait here for want of forcible arguments, as those may be ready to imagine, who have been accustomed to read the Bible under a strong bias in favour of contrary principles. This was the manner, I freely own, in which I formerly read the sacred Scriptures: nor could I, for a while, without considerable difficulty, consult them upon the present point unrestrained from previously imbibed sentiments. It was with care and pains that I brought myself so far to suspect the truth of common doctrines, as to be able, with tolerable freedom of mind, to inquire whether this had a just foundation in the word of God or not. But when I had once disengaged myself from the influence of former notions, so as to be able to look into the Scriptures with a readiness to receive whatever they should teach for truth, it was truly surprising to me, to find in them such evident traces of the doctrine I am now going to prove to be a revealed

one. And indeed the difficulty in this part of my subject is not so much to find good evidence, as to collect it together from various parts of the Bible, and arrange it in such order, as that the reader may easily have a clear and distinct view of it, and be able, without perplexity, to judge upon it in its full and united force.

Chauncey.

CONVERSION.

We have received a letter from Mr. J. B. Dods, of Levant, (Me.) in which he says, that he occasionally preached the Calvinistic doctrine for about two years. He was convinced of the untruth of Calvinism long before he became a believer in Universalism, which was last March. We cannot refrain from indulging the liberty of quoting one sentence from a private letter. He says, "I am well acquainted with the Calvinist doctrine, and to my lasting sorrow, have spent the morning of my days, yea, a very valuable part of my life, in advocating a doctrine, which, for cruelty, exceeds the powers of imagination to portray; and ascribes to the "Father of mercies" a character which would disgrace the supposed "foul monster of the regions of despair." I sometimes shudder on reviewing my sermons; to behold what ideas I have urged upon the minds of others as solemn truth: but I knew not what I did."

Chris. Intel.

ROCHESTER MAGAZINE.

We have received the first number of the "*Rochester Magazine, and Theological Review*," edited by our Br. Thompson, and published monthly, 16 pages, 8vo. at one dollar per annum, payable in advance. Considering the location of this Magazine, and the ability of the Editor, it is keeping within bounds to say, that much may be expected. Any subscriptions left at this office, will be forwarded to the Editor, &c.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Subject—ISA. IX. 6.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

An adjourned Meeting of the Stockholders of the GOSPEL HERALD Establishment, will be held on Wednesday Evening next, March 3d, at 7 o'clock, at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street. Punctual attendance is earnestly solicited.

Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 6, 1824.

NO. 43.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

NAKED CALVINISM.

M. Editor—As the doctrine of John Calvin has been so long, and by so great a portion of my brethren of the human family, received as the doctrine of truth, and of the Bible, I feel it a duty, which a desire to increase the happiness of my fellow men urges me to perform, to solicit their candid, and, if possible, their unprejudiced attention to the foundation and superstructure of that system in its native dress; stripped of all the sophisms with which it is usually disguised by its advocates.

1st. Calvinism declares, that *all* men fell in Adam, so that they became *justly* liable to death temporal, death spiritual, and death eternal. It declares, that the eternal, immutable justice of God, annexed this penalty to the law he gave to Adam, commanding him not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and that both Adam and all his posterity became *justly* liable to death temporal and spiritual, and to the pains of hell *for ever*, by that *one* rebellious act.

Let us now inquire into and examine the true situation in which Calvin has placed the whole race of mankind. God gave them a *righteous* law, proceeding from his eternal, immutable justice, which justice, immutable as it is, declares, that if they *eat* they shall die temporally, die spiritually, and suffer the pains of hell *for ever*. They have eaten! and the eternal, the immutable justice of **JEHOVAH** has pronounced their sentence. What is it? Answer. Adam, and all the millions of our race, shall die temporally and spiritually, and suffer the pains of hell *for ever*. Where now is the least ray of hope, for one of the guilty condemned race? Will the Eternal **JEHOVAH** suffer the sentence which his eternal justice has pronounced, to be revoked? Much less will he himself consent to become an accessory to a plan, by which the most rebellious of the apostate race shall escape unpunished, transported to the regions of eternal bliss, and live in his presence *for ever*, the everlasting monuments of the imbecility of his government, and inefficiency of his laws.

The great Calvin has devised the plan, by which all this is effected, which plan he calls *Gospel*. Hear him. The Eternal Son of God now steps forth and addresses the Eternal Father. Father, I know and acknowledge thy law which thou gavest to man, to be just and righteous, and the sentence thou hast pronounced upon them has proceeded upon the principles of thine eternal *justice*, they do indeed *deserve* to suffer death and the pains of hell *for ever*.

But I have set my *love* upon a *select few* of them, who are the *most vile* of all the fallen posterity; and such is my love for them, that *I am willing to suffer, in my own person*, all their deaths, and their pains of hell *for ever*, in their room and stead. And thou knowest, I am able to do this; for I am like thyself; I am as truly and properly God, as thou art; and can therefore suffer in a small space of time, as much as they can all suffer should they endure the pains of hell to all eternity. Perfectly acceptable, replies the Father. I am well pleased, for I also *love a few*, and they are the same that thou lovest, and thou hast manifested thy great wisdom in the plan thou hast proposed in which I perfectly accord. Thou hast acknowledged my sentence *just*; the whole race, without an exception, have, by the act of their *head* and *representative*, become so infinitely vile and guilty, having all committed an *infinite sin*, in him their head, eternal justice and equity declares they ought to suffer death, and the pains of hell *for ever*. It is however a truth, that the ends of eternal *justice* will be as fully answered if *another* being shall suffer in their room and stead; for it is no way essential whether the party who suffers be the *guilty*, or the *innocent*! It is all-sufficient to satisfy my law and justice, that so much pain and torment may be witnessed in the party suffering, without any regard to his guilt or innocence. And if you, my Son, my immaculately holy Son, do but yield to my law and *justice*, the same amount of suffering, even the eternal torment due to the criminals whom you represent, I will not only let them escape their *just* sentence, but I will exalt them to unutterable and eternal bliss. For, although they have become *totally depraved*, and have rendered themselves unable to do any good thing, you, my almighty Son, art able, and I know thou wilt be perfectly holy in their room and stead. And I will transfer thy holiness to them, and impute thy righteousness to them, and consider it as though they were *themselves* perfectly holy and righteous. And they shall be taught, that *they* are thus considered holy, because I have set to their account *thy* righteousness, though they are *wholly depraved*. They shall also know, that they are the *elect*, and that I have loved them, because I *chose* to love them; not because they were any more *worthy* of my love, than the *non-elect*. And that I did *not* love the non-elect, because I did not choose to love them, though they were as *worthy* of my love as the elect. They shall be taught, that it is only the *weakness* of human nature in them, that causes them to *desire* the future happiness even of a non-elect husband or wife, child, brother, sister, or friend;

and that in their glorified state, they shall be perfectly delivered from such weakness; and thy injunction to love *all* as themselves, was only designed to be operative in *this* life, and will of course cease to be binding at their entrance into that holy state. Some remains of such a disposition may indeed be found among the *non-elect*, beyond the grave. Instance the case of the rich man in hell, supplicating for the well-being of his brethren.

This is Calvinism. Native, simple, orthodox Calvinism. And he who does not believe and receive the doctrine thus, is not sound in the faith. The writer was brought up in it, believed and advocated it for ten years, while a member of the strictest Calvinistic Baptist church in this city; whose pastor was the only preacher who did not occasionally mix with their doctrine a little *Arminianism*, and sometimes unwittingly glance at the universal goodness and benevolence of Deity. The writer was indeed while a member there, sound in the faith. He believed it, because he was taught that the Scriptures contained it. He dared not question it, lest "he should be found fighting against God." He trusts, that he is now able to show from the divinely inspired word, and from the book of nature also, that God is the All-wise, Almighty, and All-loving Creator and Father of *all* men. That he never said any should *die eternally*, or *suffer the pains of hell for ever*; or that any of the sinful and sinning children of men should escape the *just* and full measure of chastisement, that ought to be inflicted upon them. But he declares, that "he will visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes; but that he will not take away his loving-kindness nor suffer his faithfulness to fail." He never did say, and it would be blasphemy to suppose, that he could be pleased to witness, inconceivably great and awful sufferings in any being, where no reformation could be effected by it, either in the party suffering, or in those who required the chastening rod.

Now, Sir, I do not so much desire to persuade men to become Universalists, that they may be known by that appellation, exclusively. It would however give me great pleasure, if I could so state the truth as to unmake Calvinists. If I could persuade them to submit to the reproach of trusting in the living God, as the Saviour of *all* men, especially of them that *believe*; or of the *elect*, if they like the term better. If I could persuade them to believe, that Christ Jesus came into the world to manifest to the world, the stupendous, the unchangeable love of the Father, more fully and gloriously than that love had ever been manifested before; and that his glory consisted in that fulness of the grace or love and truth of the Father, which shone resplendent in all he said, in all he did; and that it was the *love* of the Father that moved him to deliver up the Son to be the bearer of a message of Love, that he knew would subject him to the shameful death of the cross:—that the *love* of the Son moved him to deliver that message of love, at the mighty expense which can be estimated only in proportion as we can realize the bitter malignity of his persecutors,

which followed him to the agonizing garden, his bloody sweat, and overwhelming sorrow there, in anticipation of his dolorous and bloody death. A death, occasioned by the iniquitous and murderous dispositions and designs of the men, to whom he bore this testimony of love. As it is written, "He was bruised for," or by, and on account of, their iniquities, and "the chastisement of their peace," or the consequence of his proclaiming their peace, was upon him. The Father forsook him; or, in the words of Paul, "freely delivered him up for us all." Thus we follow him to the accursed tree, where we seem to see the mighty flame of love extinguished by the departure of his wondrous Spirit, from the immaculate human form, whose touch had raised the dead, whose look had penetrated the depth of the human heart, the secrets of the soul; and whose word had healed the maladies both of the body and mind.

But we will not dwell too long upon this wonderful exhibition of mingled love and grief. It pleased the Father to put him to grief. We hasten to the sepulchre, that we may behold, on the resurrection-morn, the consummated glory of this wondrous visitation of Deity to man. We see him commanding death itself to subserve the purposes of his love, removing its hitherto impenetrable veil; bringing to light life and immortality by the triumphant resurrection of Jesus, as the first-fruits from the dead: the first born of every creature. Thereby giving assurance or certainty to all men, that they shall partake with him of immortality and glory; when all shall be made alive in him, who have died in Adam; when that which is sown in dishonour, shall be raised in glory. To be fully persuaded to accept this scriptural testimony of the *love* of God, I know, by experience, will excite strong desires to be like him. Will enable us to trust and rejoice in him evermore; and give confidence to pray unto him without ceasing, and without doubting.

WITNESS.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

ON REDEMPTION.

Some are essentially erroneous in their ideas of the *nature* of redemption, satisfaction, and reconciliation of Jesus Christ, in believing that the outward coming, or external sufferings, blood and death of Jesus the son of the virgin Mary, redeemed, atoned, and saved all mankind from future misery, and from all sin. Whereas Christ's external advent under an external and moral, or political covenant, to an external Israel, who were sinners and transgressors of the external, or moral and political laws, which God had commanded them to obey; was, as Paul declares, Gal. iv. 4, "*To redeem them who were under the law*" by Moses: It was to redeem the external Jews from the external sins and transgressions against that *first* covenant of God with man; that a new covenant might succeed this old one. Paul says, "Jesus Christ was made under the law:" and Jesus said, that not one jot or tittle of the law should pass away until it was all fulfilled; and he did not fulfil and end it, before he said it is finished,

and bowed his head and gave up his spirit. Consequently, he lived under the law till he expired on the cross. During his life, therefore, he commanded his disciples to do those things that were commanded by them who sat in Moses's seat. He who was to be the light of the gentiles, and all nations, was confined in his first, and outward mission, to the house of an outward Israel. He told his disciples accordingly, Go not into any city of the gentiles, or even Samaritans, for he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. To this outward Israel he was an outward Shiloh, sent from God. The external covenant must have continued 'till the vail of the temple, and vail of his divinity was rent at his decease. Then was the law and its sins and transgressions ended. The bondage of Israel to the law of Moses was ended, at this sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, fifty days, previous to the coming of the gospel law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus on mount Zion, at the day of Pentecost.

As Moses was a mediator in the first covenant, so Christ is called the Mediator of the New-Testament; which mediatorship he obtained by means of death. Heb. ix. 15. And it cannot be proved that this death was the Spiritual redemption, reconciliation, or atonement of all souls from sins; for Paul says, it was—"For the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament." And if, of the first testament, it was not for the redemption of the transgressions under the *new* covenant. For this requires the Spiritual blood and presence of the Mediator of the New-Testament to purge away. Redemption is, therefore, external and internal. Christ Jesus redeemed all men from the law, and the sins and transgressions of it, by his external advent and death: and he especially redeems us from the sins and transgressions against his law of the Spirit of life, by creating in us new and clean hearts and affections, by the sprinkling of the Spirit, which is his spiritual blood, upon our hearts, and by thus "*purging our consciences from dead works to serve the living God*," in this new life from God. This correct view of redemption, &c. agrees with the external nature of the first covenant, and the internal nature of the new one. The external covenant was typical and moral; cleansing the outside of the cup and platter of an external Israel, elected of God; but the internal covenant is substantial and spiritual; cleansing the inside, even the heart and conscience of every spiritual son of Jacob, the Messiah, the elect of God. Jesus is this Jacob or Israel: and all in him are elected in him, at their new creation. This view of redemption shows us, what sins and transgressions were put an end to, (spoken of by Daniel ix. 24.) by the first or outward coming of the Messiah: and what sins and transgressions are terminated by the internal coming and establishment of the kingdom of heaven within us. This kingdom is the paradise of God below, with the tree of life, and the waters of salvation; and the Lamb is the light of it. This view may inform us what is meant by being born of the Spirit of God; being born of the incorruptible seed, Jesus Christ, the living word of God, and light that enlightens

all. And they only are his true children, who are born again, and born of his light. They only are thus born, who walk in his light of life; or without a metaphor, they who obey the light in them. Hence, too, we may see, that the blood and flesh of Jesus, that saves or redeems, is spiritual; and is the Lord from heaven, who is the only Saviour; and that it is folly, (if not idolatry) to believe we are saved and redeemed by the outward coming, sufferings or death of the Son of the Virgin Mary.

MORRIS-COUNTY-MAN.

P. S. The word tabernacle, *meshekh*, is derived from *shekhakh*, to cover. For, to cover, signifies atonement, Isa. xxviii. 18, and the ark's covering, or the mercy-seat, is called the propitiatory—May God's spirit cover us. For "wo unto them who are covered with a covering (i. e. atoned with an atonement) and not of my spirit," said the Lord, by Isaiah. If these things be true, Calvinists and Universalists misunderstand the nature of the external and internal atonement or reconciliation; God's external salvation of all men, and his internal and spiritual salvation of those who believe, i. e. believe him when come internally, and accordingly follow him in the regeneration.

REMARKS.

If we understand our correspondent, he declares in his *first* paragraph, or wishes it to be taken for granted, or attempts to prove, that the external, or visible coming of Christ, into this world, "was to redeem the *external Jews* from the *external sins*," &c. Or, "to redeem *them* who were under the *law* by *Moses*." Was this all? Then the command, "Rejoice, O ye *nations*, his *people*," &c. is *mal appropos*. The phrase, "*political covenant*," we consider altogether incongruous. The phrase, "*vail of his divinity* was rent at his decease," we do not understand.

Our correspondent will please to permit us to correct him of a monstrous error in his classification of "Calvinists and Universalists." Sir, we inform you, that we neither believe nor teach, that the "outward coming, or external sufferings, blood and death of Jesus the son of the virgin Mary, redeemed, atoned, and saved all mankind from *future misery*, and from all sin." Christ came, as he himself asserts, "that ye may *have life*," &c. But we both believe and teach, that the coming of Christ was in conformity to the *purpose* of God, which is, "in the dispensation of the *fulness of times* [not before,] to gather together in one all things in Christ." All are not *now* gathered. All are not *now* saved from their sins. But, Sir, God's promise was made to Christ, the Mediator, and the new testament, (not covenant) is our evidence of this; and we contend, that the new testament is not "*confirmed of God in Christ*," if man's assistance is subsequently indispensable. See Gal. iii. 17. Farther—The threatenings of the law can all be executed, and the recipients afterwards become participants of the blessing "*confirmed of God in Christ*." For the law is not against the promises of God. See Rom. v. 20, 21. Gal. iii. 19.

Of the *second* paragraph, we have only occasion

to remark, that God's promise and purpose is more explicit than our correspondent. That is, the assurances we have in the Scriptures, and the corroborating evidence in all God's works. It is useless to multiply words. The declaration—that "*all shall be taught of God,*" that God will write his law in the hearts of men; that all shall be raised incorruptible and immortal, is too unequivocal to admit of doubt in the mind of any but unbelievers, who are skeptics, or infidels. God's purpose is the salvation of all men, from sin. Christ came in conformity to his purpose. If it is not *now* fully accomplished, we have God's promise that it *shall* be, and that is all *we* want.

Our correspondent's Postscript, is an expression of *his* opinion; not God's prophets'. His quotation is from Isaiah xxx. 1. The connexion will inform him, that "the strength of Pharaoh, and the *shadow* of Egypt," is the *covering* spoken of! We read, "Blessed are they whose *iniquities are forgiven,* and whose *sins are covered.*" Not, "*Wo* unto them." Covering with God's Spirit, and covering with *man's* spirit and means, whether of Pharaoh, or ourselves, are two things!

BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE CRUSADES.

By the Crusades, or Croisades, we are to understand the *Wars* which commenced, Anno Domini 1096, by those who called themselves *Christians*, against the Infidels, for the conquest of Palestine. It arose from a superstitious regard for those places, where the Saviour of the world had wrought miracles, was crucified, buried, and arose from the dead. Jerusalem having been captured by Omar, the pilgrims from all quarters met with much difficulty in performing their tour to the holy sepulchre, though permitted to do it, by paying tribute to the Saracen caliphs, till the Turks took possession of Palestine. An opinion about that time, being prevalent in Europe, that Christ would soon make his appearance in the Holy land, to judge the world, journeys thither were deemed highly meritorious, and pilgrims in multitudes flocked to the tomb of the Saviour, returning to Europe with aggravated complaints against the Turks, for the indignities they had suffered, and the profane derision of sacred things they had witnessed in the holy city of Jerusalem.

Gregory VII. attempted to form a combination of all the Princes in Christendom against the Mahometans—but failed on account of the enmity previously excited by his unprincipled intrusion upon their rights. Peter the Hermit, however, having visited Jerusalem, and deprecating the oppression of eastern Christians and the dangers to which pilgrims were exposed, formed the hazardous design of marching a sufficient force to Asia, from the remote regions of the West, to subdue those warlike and potent nations, by which Palestine was possessed and enslaved. His plan being communicated to Pope Martin II. a council was summoned at Placentia, consisting of 400 ecclesiastics, and 30,000 seculars, which convened in a plain, while both Peter and the Pope addressed the multitude in such a pathetic

manner that all, as one, filled with indignation towards the Infidels, called aloud for war, and promised to support it, at the expense of blood and treasure. After Peter had visited the principal cities in Christendom, and the chief sovereigns had been made acquainted with his vast designs, another council was called at Clermont in Auvergne, where the greatest prelates, nobles and princes, were so moved by the pathos of Peter and the Pope, that they exclaimed with the rest of the multitude, as if urged by a divine impulse, "It is the will of God;" which words were made the signal of rendezvous and battle in all succeeding adventures. Men of all ranks, enlisted in the holy enterprize, and wore a *cross* on the right shoulder, as the emblem of their profession. Ignorance and superstition, disorder and degrading crimes prevailed in Europe. A military spirit, without discipline, became the ruling passion of the nations, under the feudal law. Hence by suppressing hostilities of a more internal character, and uniting the valorous and blood-thirsty millions in the project of Peter, the sceptre of death was waved with insolence over the cities of Asia.

The crusades being considered the only road to heaven, priests, peasants, nobles, and artizans, became soldiers of the cross; and all who declined the service were reproached as impious and pusillanimous. Estates were sold at low prices, and large contributions made to support the holy war. The zeal of women was so great, that they left the proper sphere of action, disguised themselves in the habiliments and armour of men, and entered the camp, or *disgraced their sex* by devoting themselves to the army. The most wicked were sometimes ambitious in the common cause, in hopes of expiating past offences. A detachment of 300,000 undisciplined, unprincipled soldiers, under the command of Peter, and a soldier of fortune, named Walter the *MONEYLESS*, preceded the main army, and marched through Hungary and Bulgaria, for Constantinople, confiding in a supernatural supply of provisions; but being disappointed, they obtained by plunder what was expected by miracles, till the enraged inhabitants slaughtered them in multitudes. Of the more disciplined armies, 700,000 men passed the straits of Constantinople, and mustered in the plains of Asia. Nine princes and many lords were engaged in the first crusade. Jerusalem was taken by the confederated army. GODFREY, who besieged and took the city of Nice, was chosen king. The first crusade ended when the Christians gained the famous battle of Ascalon against the Sultan of Egypt; though the spirit of crusading lasted nearly two centuries. The *second* crusade was headed by the emperor Conrad III. and Louis VII. king of France, A. D. 1144. The *third*, in 1188, immediately after Jerusalem was captured by Saladin, Sultan of Egypt; the *fourth*, was undertaken 1195, by Henry VI. after Saladin's death; the *fifth*, by Pope Innocent III. in 1198; the *sixth* began about 1228; the *seventh*, in 1249, was headed by St. Lewis; and the *eighth*, 1270, by the same prince, who made himself master of the castle of Carthage, but soon died, leaving his army in con-

fusion. Since that time several popes have attempted to raise another crusading spirit, but have not succeeded. During these dreadful *holy wars*, every crime was committed, every kind of suffering endured, and millions were brought to an untimely grave.

The crusaders were their own worst enemies by internal feuds and dissensions. They set up three small states, one at Jerusalem, one at Antioch, and the other at Edessa, which instead of assisting each other, were at war, committing such horrid cruelties as must have excited in the Turks, the bitterest hatred against their religion. When Jerusalem was taken by them, not the numerous garrison only, but the inhabitants, men, women, and children were massacred without pity. They marched towards the sepulchre of the merciful Jesus, over heaps of the dead, and wading in the blood of the innocent, sung anthems of praise. Yea, more; overcome with religious enthusiasm, these barbarous monsters burst into tears at the sight of the sacred tomb.

If any thing in their conduct exceeded the common course of ferocity and crime, it must be the phrensy with which the teachers inspired little children, in 1204, to promote the crusading expeditions. Thousands of those innocent creatures were taken from their parents, on the superstitious use of the words, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise." Their merciless conductors sold them to the Turks, or suffered them miserably to perish. To relate a millionth part of the criminality, atrocity, infatuation, ignominy, and wretchedness of the Crusades, or wars under the cross of Christ, for the suppression of infidelity in Palestine, would require volumes. See *Hume's History of Eng. and Mosheim's Eccle. Hist.*

—♦—

From the New-York Evening Post.

In the Evening Post of the 20th inst. proof is required, that Mr. John Murray carried this doctrine (viz. that the end sanctifies the means) so far as to assert, that "Judas was an excellent character, because, in betraying the Lord of life and glory, he had fulfilled the prophecies and brought a flood of happiness into the world," as asserted in the article under the head of a *Terrible Mistake, No. 4.* published in the same paper of the 10th.

Instead of proof, I offer the following explanation.

In the year 1791, Mr. John Murray, finding his favourite doctrine of UNIVERSAL SALVATION assailed by frequent sermons on the treachery and suicide of Judas, thought proper to make the *salvation of Judas* the subject of a discourse, which was delivered at the Universalist House in Boston, in the autumn of that year, to a crowded auditory.

His text was from the 3d, 4th, and 5th verses of the 27th chapter of Matthew. "Then Judas, who had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? See thou to that. And he cast down the thirty

pieces of silver in the temple, and departed and went and hanged himself."

The following is a syllabus of Mr. Murray's discourse.

"For the conversion of those, who believe in a *partial* God and a *partial* Saviour, and for the comfort of those, who trust that all, who died in Adam, shall be made alive in Christ, I will endeavour to show that Judas has a place among the ransomed in glory. May the words of our mouth, and the meditations of our hearts, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer."

"The treachery of Judas was a necessary link in the chain of salvation. He, who hardened the heart of Pharaoh, and raised up Cyrus to subdue nations before him, permitted this sinning and repenting Judas to be an instrument in the work of redeeming mercy."

"By orthodox teachers, great stress has been laid on the treachery and suicide of Judas. From them we hear nothing of his penitence; but this, my friends, is the Keystone of the Christian Arch. He, who enjoined you to forgive a penitent brother seventy times seven: He, who, in the agonies of crucifixion, prayed for his enemies, and who announced to the thief on the cross an opening paradise, is now ascended to his Father and our Father. He there holds open the arms of his everlasting love to embrace every repenting and returning sinner; and pointing to the infinite efficacy of his atonement, is proclaiming, 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'"

"Judas, my friends, was not only a penitent, but his repentance was more marked and better evidenced than was the penitence of Job, Solomon, Jeremiah, or St. Paul, four worthies, whose lives and writings occupy great space in this sacred volume."

Here Mr. Murray gave a luminous and extended view of the penitence of each, and in the contrast assigned a decided preponderance to the penitence of Judas, "for," says he, "this man, when he saw that Jesus was condemned, REPENTED himself, cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and went and hanged himself. We are not told, that he *appeared* or *affected* to repent, but that he REPENTED: and in proof of his sincerity he threw from him the accursed thing, which had bribed him to betray his Lord and Master. He did not follow the example of David, who, after his repentance, took to his arms the tempter, that had weaned him from God and duty, and whose husband he had caused to be slain in the fore front of the battle; but Judas was so contrite, so prostrated, so much like dust and ashes, that even life was insupportable. He lost the self command, which sustains under distresses of soul less poignant, and he went away and hanged himself."

"Now, if this eminent penitent was not brought within the pale of salvation, in vain have I preached, and in vain have you heard. This volume abounds with proofs, that he, who came to seek and to save that which was lost, to redeem from the curse

of the law, to nail to his cross the hand-writing of ordinances against us, to be a mighty conqueror over sin, death, and hell, and finally to deliver up to the Father the fruits of his victory, that God might be all in all, *has saved the repenting Judas*, and will save us all, not through any worth or worthiness in us, but through rich and boundless grace."

"Having shown that Judas excelled in deep penitence, the patriarchs, the prophets, and the apostle, permit me, my brethren, to compare his penitence with your own. I know many of you in the house and by the way-side. I see you, behind your counters, and in your various callings, anxious for that treasure which moth and rust will corrupt. The searcher of hearts knows that you are too much attached to the mammon of this world. Some of you make hard bargains, and some of you withhold that which is meet: I hope that none of you grind the faces of the poor. When on the Sabbath you come to the Lord's house, the faithful monitor within reminds you of the work of the week, and you say, 'Lord, we have sinned: we have left undone those things, which we ought to have done: we have done those things, which we ought not to have done: and there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou those, O God, who confess their faults. Restore thou those, who are penitent:' and you profess to be deeply penitent: but after all, you return to a like week's work, and too often, when you have defrauded, you hug the money in your pockets."

"Not so did Judas; for when he found, that he had betrayed the Lord of life and glory, though in the act of fulfilling the prophecies, and of bringing a flood of happiness upon the world, he REPENTED of the treachery, threw the money down upon the table, and went and hanged himself."

"To his blessed consummation, though not by the same inglorious means, may God bring us all, through Christ our Lord."

The above exhibits the leading points, and much of the language of the sermon. It appears that the character of Judas was rested on his SINCERE REPENTANCE: therefore that the reference to Mr. Murray, in support of the doctrine, *that the end sanctifies the means*, was incorrect; but the mistake arose from haste, and a limited view of the discourse. 1776.

Note—We are ignorant of the cause of the insertion of the above extract from Mr. Murray's Sermon, in THE NEW-YORK EVENING POST. Mr. Murray's remarks on Judas's repentance, when shorn of the error which eclipses them, will stand the test. Namely—"He lost the self command, which sustains under distresses of soul less poignant, and he went away and *hanged himself*." Mr. M., being unacquainted with the original Greek, made the best of an erroneous translation. See Matt. xxvii. 5. The translators evidently laboured to make Judas an actor, and the destroyer of himself. They have multiplied the conjunction *καὶ* to double of the original; and rendered *ἀνέβητο* *hanged*, when its signification is simply *suffocated*. They have represented Judas as *acting*, when the original

represents him as *suffering passively*. When the inspired writers wished to express their sentiments, or to relate facts, they were at no loss to find suitable words and phrases. The critical examiner will find, that on all occasions, where the word *hanged* properly occurs in the translation, the original uniformly signifies *suspended*.

If the Editor of the *Evening Post* is of opinion this correction will subserve the cause of truth, he will confer a favour by inserting it in his paper.

ED. GOS. HER.

From the *Christian Intelligencer*.

A HINT TO YOUNG PREACHERS.

Something like a year after entering upon the duties of the ministry, I spent an evening with a venerable and worthy gentleman, who afterwards became my father-in-law. He was of the Baptist persuasion, and a bright ornament to his profession. Among other topics of conversation, that of *great preachers* became a subject of discourse. Full of enthusiastic zeal, and favoured by Providence with a ready utterance, and commanding voice, I had succeeded in my itinerant labours very far beyond my expectations; and withal had already felt some itchings to become a *great preacher*. I mentioned the names of some in my own order, the splendour of whose talents eclipsed, in my opinion, the brilliancy of all others. The old gentleman, in turn, enumerated a number who were the most distinguished among the Baptists. But, said he, for my part, I prefer a *good preacher* to a *great one*. These words, connected with the artless and sound gravity with which they were uttered, touched the very quick of my soul. I saw the propriety of them, and after meditating upon them a short time, settled down upon the resolution to become a *good preacher*, if possible, and never to indulge in inquietude about *ministerial greatness*. Though this occurrence was almost twenty years ago, I have not, I believe, from that time to this, arranged a sermon without recollecting the remark of my venerable friend and parent. Will the discourse be a *good one*? This circumstance, it is believed, though trivial in itself, may be useful to those who have just commenced their labours in "the ministry of reconciliation." They are prone to thirst for professional eminence, and if they associate in their mind, genuine eminence with real holiness and moral virtue, the desire is commendable and salutary. But the glare of splendid talents, the charm of popularity, and of public applause, are too apt to dazzle their eyes, and deceive their hearts. I have rarely known an instance in which a preacher, young or old, attempted to deliver what the world would call a great sermon, without failing, and tormenting his audience with a bad one. A great sermon, in the popular acceptance of the term, is one in which the sentiments and descriptions soar far beyond the common capacities. Now a moment's sober reflection will convince us, that a sentiment or a description so humble that our loftiest vision cannot perceive it, is as suitable and as useful to us, as the one which soars so sublimely that our little eyes cannot reach

it. Let the minister of Christ bear in mind, that goodness is sterling greatness, and he will walk in the right way, "the path of the just that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." These hasty remarks may, if duly improved, be profitable to societies which are destitute of the stated ministry of the word. Guided by the rule here recommended, they will find but little difficulty in obtaining an acceptable preacher; one who will promote their "growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." They should remember that there are, comparatively, but few in the vineyard of our Lord and Master, who are distinguished for natural talents, but many, who let their measure of "light shine before men." I close my remarks by repeating, that goodness is sterling greatness; and the only greatness about which a rational creature can, with propriety, indulge a moment's anxiety.

S. S.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

New-York, March 1, 1824.

Sir—I must confess I was considerably disappointed in your answer to me, in your last number. You say, I am mistaken. In what am I mistaken? My communication certainly could not lead you to believe, that I had read the passages spoken of, so superficially, as to think Tabeal had been seated on the throne of Ahaz. You ask the questions, "What shall not come to pass? What shall not stand?" and you quote only a *part* of verse 6, and speak of that *part only*, which did not come to pass; but if *part* of verse 6, will answer your questions, the *other* part certainly will. "What shall not come to pass? What shall not stand?" Ans. verse 6, "Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein." This was the counsel which Syria, Ephraim, and the Son of Remaliah took against Judah. Now, I ask, Did it not stand? Did it not come to pass? And yet, you say, or intimate, you can find no discrepancy. Look once more, and if you cannot find a contradiction in the two stories, there is no meaning in language; a flat contradiction is evident; the former, as well as the latter part of verse 6, Isaiah told king Ahaz, should not come to pass. If I tell one truth, and one falsehood, am I not a liar?

By the same method which you have adopted, to prove that one chapter "confirms" the other, (viz. by disjoining a sentence) any thing may be proved, even "That there is no God." Will it be said, Isaiah was sent to comfort king Ahaz, by merely assuring him, that Tabeal should not succeed to the throne; or that the hearts of Ahaz and his people were moved, only in consequence of their fear that Tabeal would ascend the throne of Judah? The passage conveys no such idea, or I am indeed, a very superficial reader. Verse 2, "And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with Ephraim; and his heart was moved," &c. The fact is, (as stated in the "Old Book") a powerful army was marching against Judah, and Ahaz and his people, dreaded the issue. Isaiah met Ahaz, and told him to "fear not," &c. We may judge

what Ahaz's opinion of Isaiah as a prophet was, if he even reflected on it, when he found his son, the governor of his house, the next man to himself, and 120,000 of his valiant men slain. The 28th chap. of 2d Chronicles, records a complete victory gained over Ahaz, which Isaiah told him not to fear, and said should not come to pass. You say, the books of Chronicles, would be liable to alterations, but if we suppose this chapter to have been altered by the kings of Judah, we will naturally be lead to suppose that they made the story to appear better than it actually was. By the majority of professing Christians, the books of Chronicles are considered the word of God, just as much as the prophecies of Isaiah are, if they are not, it should be made known. It was not my intention to enter into a controversy as regards the validity of the Bible; but thus far I have been drawn into one, by what I consider a misrepresentation. It was my wish to know, where the coming of Jesus Christ is spoken of in the prophecies. If the 7th chapter of Isaiah, has no reference to him, I know of none that will apply to him any better than it does. Your well wisher,

L.

ANSWER.

We request our correspondent, L., to pause, a moment, and inquire, What *spirit* am I of? We are not his judge. But we caution him not to cherish a spirit hostile to the Scriptures; which will inevitably increase his blindness to their contents. We ask you, Sir, Are not you rather disposed to wish the Scriptures to prove contradictory and false, than the contrary? Do you, at present, feel solicitous to find them harmonious? Or do you desire to prove them absurd and false?

You say, we quote only a part of Isaiah vii. 6. We will now quote the whole, and confirm our previous assertion. "Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a *breach therein for us*, and set a *king* in the midst of *it*, the son of Tabeal." If these words are considered according to their true signification, they import the following—that the object, end and aim, of the enemies of Judah was, to *subjugate the country*, and set a *king* in the country, instead of Ahaz; namely, the *son of Tabeal*. Did this come to pass? You, Sir, must answer in the *negative*. Is it not trifling to say, that the prophet told a falsehood, because they made the attempt, and vexed, or troubled the king of Judah. Supposing the kings of England and France, were to say, "Let us go up against America, and vex it, and let us make a *breach therein for us*, and set a *king* in the midst of *it*, the son of Napoleon;" and the president, Mr. Monroe, and the people should be troubled, and *you* were to say, "It shall *not* stand, *neither* shall it come to pass;" and the attempt was made, 120,000 men killed, and 200,000 carried away captives, &c. and after the contest, the government of America remained as before; would you admit that you had declared a falsehood? Would you consider the making the *attempt*, and the slaying of men, in the attempt, the taking of prisoners, &c. an evidence that they had made a *breach* in America, and set the son of Napo-

leon as *king*, in the midst of it? No, Sir, under these circumstances, you would "laugh the man to scorn," who should assail your reputation for veracity, with such one-sided logic.

The major propositions of the passage, are the following—To make a *breach* in Judah, and to set a king, the son of Tabeal, in the midst of it. The going up against Judah, or vexing, that is, fighting Judah, was, of necessity, preparatory to the attaining the end in view, which was, to make a *breach* in Judah, and set a *king* therein. The prophet did not say, that they should not make the attempt. But, that the thing threatened should *not stand*, should not come to pass. The *breach*, (the destruction of the king of Judah,) was not made. The son of Tabeal was not set as king, in the place of Ahaz. We fervently pray, that we may never declare a greater falsehood, than did the prophet in this instance. That we may always come as close to the truth, as he did, in his declaration to Ahaz. If so, we shall do well.

L.'s second paragraph is a poor helper of the first. His conclusions have his opinions for premises. The son of Tabeal was not to *succeed* Ahaz, in ordinary succession; but Ahaz was to be thrust from his throne with violence; and another to reign in his stead. 2 Chron. xxviii. contains no record of any event, which Isaiah designated, and declared should not come to pass.

We consider the books of Chronicles as a history. We are not accountable for the opinions of others. A record of the events which transpired in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, &c. and the *word of God*, are two things. God's *word* is represented as *fire*. The books of Chronicles that we have, are *paper*, &c. The *word of God* is said to be *life*. But these books are *inanimate*.

We assure our correspondent, that we have no desire for controversy. If we are interrogated, we answer. If we are attacked, we defend ourselves, with no other weapon than the truth. We do not believe the Scriptures to be what they purport, because others believe them. Neither shall we reject them, because others reject them. It is L.'s *own* concern. His denial of the Scriptures cannot harm us. His reception of them, will benefit *himself*. We wish his prosperity, in every proper sense of the term; and we assure him, that the rejection of the truth, will injure *him* more than others, and benefit no one.

We name the following passages, for his consideration, as prophecies of Christ. Isa. xlii. 1—9; liii. 1—3. lxiii. 1—6. See Matt. xii. 15—21. Luke iv. 14—21.

From the (Portland) Christian Intelligencer.

PULPIT DECLAMATION!

Mr. Editor—A few weeks since, the Rev. Mr. Smith of this town, of whose *own services* in the desk, I am not disposed to complain, exchanged in the afternoon of a Sabbath, with Rev. Dr. Payson. The Dr. took for his text, these words of the *Son of man*—"I thirst." Among other things equally as *reasonable and scriptural*, he spake to this amount:

"*Thirst* is expressive of the most intense and dreadful suffering of which human nature is susceptible. Its torments are more painful and excruciating than any other sensation to which mortals are exposed. Historians inform us, that a man having committed an atrocious and unpardonable crime, was sentenced to languish for water, and die with *thirst*, that being the *greatest punishment* that could be inflicted; and that in the midst of his agony, the man declared, he *thirsted for the blood* of his *father and mother*. Having the means at his command, (a lancet or knife,) he actually made an incision in his arm, and *drank his own blood*! What then must have been the degree of suffering, when He who created the Universe—who caused the springs to flow, the streams to run, the rains to fall, and the ocean to abound with waters, cried aloud, "I thirst!" but was denied one drop, when agonizing in death upon the cross!"

Now, Sir, accustomed as I am to venerate learned and pious ministers, and to receive "the droppings of the sanctuary" without trying them too much in the *crucible* of human reason, I must confess, the above declarations, or the same in substance, made me revolt at the idea of the Trinity. When I am brought to believe that the *Creator* of the universe, "who holds the waters in the hollow of his hands," entered into a covenant with the *first Person* of HIMSELF, to die with thirst on the cross, I can also admit that he *froze to death*, or any thing else, no matter how absurd! In my opinion, there is as much propriety in maintaining the doctrine of the *real presence*, and that we *eat and drink* the Deity, by peace-meal, as to pretend HE suffered and died like a culprit, who *thirsted* for the *blood* of his *parents*, and died, *drinking his own*!

Love not the world, neither the things *that are* in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him: for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. 1 John ii. 15, 16.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"What think ye of Christ?—Matt. xxii. 42.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

BALFOUR'S INQUIRY.

We have this week received a number of copies of "An Inquiry into the Scripture import of the words SHEOL, HADES, TARTARUS, and GEHENNA; all translated HELL, in the common English Version. By Walter Balfour. Charlestown," (Mass.) There are a few copies extra, after Subscribers are supplied, which can be purchased at this office. Also, For Sale—"Ballou's Eleven Sermons."

☞ Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1824.

NO. 44.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

EXCOMMUNICATION OF MRS. MATHEWSON.

Mr. Fitz—We send you the within letter, hoping that you may see fit to give it a place in your Herald; and such comments as you may think proper. In the summer of 1823, this lady lost her husband. Her daughter at the same time, lay at the point of death. The Baptist members came in to console her. She for the first time declared to them her faith. The alarm gun was now fired. She was soon after called before the Baptist church for heresy. They accused her of being a *backslider* and a *heretic*. She then told them her experience and belief, in tears, charity, and love. One observed, *If you die in your sins, where I go ye cannot come.* She was asked, what it meant? She attempted to give an answer; but they interrupted her, by saying, *This is no place for argument.* Another observed, *If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the wicked and ungodly sinner appear?* She again attempted to reply, but was again interrupted, by observing, *This is no place for argument.* The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost was next presented; she received the same treatment; and then sat down in tears. In consequence of such treatment, she was induced to write to them her mind. The letter, of which the following is a correct copy, was sent to them, and was read, since which they have *excommunicated her*, without any other accusation than her believing in the salvation of all men. Her character in every other respect is unimpeachable. They were loath to give her up, they made her frequent visits, the general salutations were, "All men will be saved. Drunkards, thieves, murderers, whoremongers, are all brethren." A Baptist preacher of this town, by the name of James Sly, was asked by this lady, what he thought of her belief? He replied, "I think it is an awful thing—and that the devil had shot his last bolt." We, the subscribers, hope these things will not escape your notice, as we hope they may receive the just recompense of their reward. Dated at Shaftsbury, Vermont, Feb. 22, 1824.

JEREMIAH ODEL,

RUFUS MILLINGTON, GREEN BLACHMER,
JOEL STRATTON, OTIS HAYWARD.

Shaftsbury, (Vt.) Jan. 26, 1824.

My dear brethren and sisters—It is with the greatest sorrow and regret that I now write the following address to you, that must consequently exclude me from your fellowship and society. But the exercises of my mind drives me to these painful scenes of my natural feelings; although the sentiment that I now embrace, carries my mind beyond

all earthly societies, finding the blest Redeemer to be "a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." Notwithstanding my lover and friend is called from my embraces, and my brethren and sisters turn from me as from an heretic; yet, "in the Lord have I righteousness and strength;" there I feel to cast all my sorrows and burdens, that I pass through in this chequered scene of life, which are not few nor small.

True, my brethren, I have called on the dear Saviour of the world to plead my cause, that I might ever be suitably prepared to meet every scene of life, both spiritual and temporal, and that my mind might ever be directed to all truth, and that I might ever have right views of the holy Scriptures, that I might not be deceived. This has been the desire of my heart ever since I first experienced the love of God in my soul, which was in the year 1799; which I strove hard to obtain by my *own* works; but I found I could not: I was obliged to fall into the hands of the blest Redeemer, wretch, as I was, for I could do nothing of myself to merit salvation. Then the love of Jesus flowed into my soul, and at that time I saw a fulness in Christ for the whole human family, and thought I could myself convince my fellow youth of the realities of a Saviour; but, alas! I found myself mistaken.

Soon after this, I went to live with a Baptist minister, and in conversation told him, that I thought there was a fulness in Christ for the *whole* human family; but the answer he made me was this: "True, it seems, when the love of God *first* flows into any one's soul, they think there is a *sufficiency* for the *whole* race of Adam; but, alas! dear sister, you will find yourself mistaken. I can soon convince you, and tell you what is right." As he was a strong Calvinist, he quoted a number of passages which he thought were the strongest on that principle. The first was this: "Hath not the Potter power over the clay, to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour?" And explaining a great number of passages fully on the Calvinist sentiment, which soon convinced me that I was wrong, and he was right; this greatly confused my mind. Although I believed it was true, still, when I came to look on the human family, and think that a part of them were to be doomed to *endless* woe and misery, it caused great grief to rest on my mind, although I fully believed it was so, and for this sentiment I earnestly contended many years. But at last my mind was violently exercised again, by the *death* of one of my *brothers*, which, if my sentiment be true, doomed him to remediless woe, as he had left no convincing proof of obtaining happiness.

At this time I undertook reading the Scriptures for myself, to see whether my sentiment was agreeable to the word of God or not. This principle was so grafted in my mind that I could not give it up. But often looking upon my *tender infants*, thinking they might be doomed to endless woe and misery, which caused my blood almost to chill in my veins; but in reviewing the exercises of my mind, when I was under the influences of the Holy Spirit of God, in prayer and supplication "for all men to come unto the knowledge of the truth," then reflecting why my mind should be so exercised if it was contrary to the *will* of God, I could not tell. Being sensible that I had received a small drop of love from the *fountain* of all good, and in consequence of these perpetual reflections and researches after truth, and long deliberations, I was led to the following premises:

That there is *one* infinite and immutable God: this no reasonable person nor society will pretend to deny, (for I cannot believe in a *limited* God) this the works of creation alone demonstrate; and not only they, but the Holy Scriptures do testify to the same. Now to infer from such premises, that God, who is declared to be *love*, has, from or before the world sprang from non-existence, by his immutable decrees doomed a part of his intelligent creation to unceasing and the most excruciating torture, for crimes that were decreed they should do, is unconceivable to reason and the oracles of God; and for me, (for I mean to be an honest person) therefore, I came to this conclusion, that God being infinite, possessed wisdom to *plan*, and power to *execute*; for he has declared, that "he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." And finding it recorded in the sacred volume, that it "*is his will that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth*;" I must believe in the salvation of *all men* finally, or else his will must be revoked, and his infinity cease to be. Furthermore, it is declared in the Scriptures, "The ransom was for all men, to be testified in due time." And likewise Paul declares, that "Christ tasted death for *every man*," and will this be ineffectual? It is declared, when speaking of the dissolution of this mortal system, that "the body returns to dust, and the spirit to God who gave it;" and it is added, that Christ in his prayer to the Father hath declared, that as "the Father hath given him power over *all flesh* that he should give eternal life to as *many* as thou has given him." Brethren, should it be asked, How many are given him? It is answered, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his Son*, whom he hath appointed *heir of all things*, by whom also he made the worlds." Sisters, should further evidence be asked, I will appeal to the oracles of Divine truth; God, by the prophet Ezekiel hath declared, "*All souls are mine*." Christ to the Father sayeth, "*All thine are mine*, and mine are thine." The Father sayeth, "Ask of me, and I will give the heathen thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth thy possession."

Brethren and sisters, Am I, for *believing* all these united testimonies, to be called a *heretic*? Am I to be set at naught, and be called a *fool*, for *believing* the "*restitution of all things*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began?" Am I to be calumniated and called a *backslider*, for believing that "Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for *ours only*, but also for the sins of the *whole world*?" I believe that God hath a will, and that will is not to be determined by men; for "he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." I believe, also, there is a mystery in his will, and the apostle Paul informs us what it is; "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his *good pleasure*, which he hath *purposed in himself*, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and on earth *even*, in him." Brethren and sisters, ask yourselves the question, Do you, with the apostles, *believe* in the fulness of times? Let your consciences answer. Again, it is added, that "God *will have all men* to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth: for there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself a *ransom for all*, to be testified in due time." Dear brethren and sisters, I have received admonitions from this church, both by word and by letter, accusing me of *heresy*, and accompanied with a passage of scripture which was once repeated to me in this church, after declaring my sentiment; of which I attempted to give an explanation, but was prohibited, and told there was *no time for argument*; and in consequence of being prohibited my explanation at that time, I feel it incumbent on me to give you my opinion of the passage in writing: the words are these; "If you die in your sins, where I go ye cannot come."* Now in order to give the true meaning of this passage of scripture, I shall quote to you the following, from John xiii. 33. "Little children, yet a little while I am with you, ye shall seek me, and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you." And in the 36th verse, "Simon Peter said unto him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me *now*, but thou shalt follow me afterward." These words are direct in point, to prove that the apostles, as well as the unbelieving Jews, could not follow Christ then; but that they should follow him hereafter. Christ told the Jews, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate;" and then adds, "for I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth *till ye shall say*, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." For further proof of the restoration of that part of Israel, that was broken off through unbelief, I request you all to read the eleventh chapter of Romans, for it is there declared, that "*all should be saved*."

I have only stated a very small part of the trial of my mind on the change of my sentiment; being afraid of wearying your patience. But if you would

* There is no such passage. Probably John viii, 21. is intended. Ed.

wish for further experience on the subject, if the Lord will, I will endeavour to give a full explanation hereafter; if my mind should continue to be under the same exercise that it now is. But, dear brethren and sisters, if I should see my former sentiment to be true, I never can confess but what my heart and soul were sincere in writing this letter to you.

Now, with a short address, I will conclude. Dear brethren and sisters, although there is a separating line drawn between us here on this earthly ball, yet I feel, when Christ gathers together the sinful race of man, that I shall strike those heavenly notes, the song of praise and adoration to the Lord that liveth for ever and ever, together with you and the remaining souls which he has made. Lest I should weary your patience, I will conclude with hallelujah to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will to men.

— "Is there ambition in my heart?
Search, gracious God, and see.
Or do I act a haughty part?
Lord, I appeal to thee."

MARY MATHEWSON.

Note—In reply to the suggestion of our brethren, to offer comments, &c. on the above; we trust we shall be permitted to say, that the letter of our sister to the church, who excommunicated her for believing the truth, is sufficient of itself. The brutality, (for it deserves no better name,) of some of the members of the church, is to be lamented; for it indicates a want of common civility, to say nothing of Christianity.

ED. GOS. HER.

From the (Va. Buffalo) Chris. Baptist.
MONEY,

I think, may be considered not merely as the bond of union in popular establishments, but it is really the rock on which the popular churches are built. Before church union is proposed, the grand point to ascertain is, are we able to support a church? Before we give a "call," let us see, says the prudent saint, what we can "make up." A meeting is called; the question is put, "How much will you give?" It goes round—each man writes his name or makes his mark. A handsome sum is subscribed. A petition is sometimes presented to the legislature for an act of incorporation, to confirm their union, and to empower them to raise, by the civil law or the arm of power, the stipulated sum. All is now secure. The church is founded upon this rock. It goes into operation. The parson comes. Their social prayers, praises, sacraments, sermons and fasts, commence—every thing is put into requisition. But what was the *primum mobile*? What the moving cause? *Money*. As proof of this, let the congregation decrease by emigration or death; the money fails; the parson takes a missionary tour; he obtains a louder "call;" he removes. *Money failed* is the cause—and when this current freezes, social prayers, praises, "sacraments," sermons, and congregational feasts, all cease. *Money*, the foundation is destroyed, and down comes the superstructure raised upon it. Reader, is not this the fact? And dare you say that money is not the ba-

sis of the modern religious establishments? It begins with money—it goes on with money—it ends when money fails. The church of Jesus Christ is founded upon another basis, nourished by other means, is not dissolved by such causes, and will survive all the mines of Peru, all the gold of Ophir. The modern clergy say they do not preach for money. Very well. Let the people pay them none, and they will have as much of their preaching still. Besides there will be no suspicion of their veracity.

From the (Philadelphia) Reformer.

GERMANTOWN MISSIONARY PRAYER MEETINGS
AND GIFTS.

Mr. Reformer—I was last night a hearer, in Germantown, of one of those Missionary Sermons, called in one of your numbers, "Milking of the Goats." The result is, that there is hereafter to be a monthly concert of prayer for missions, and above all, for casting *our* mites into the treasury. Our obligations to these things are deduced from the text, "Arise, shine, thy light is come."

I thought, with the speaker, that it would indeed be a time of glory to the church, when we should all come with one heart to give our aid to sending the Gospel to every dark corner of the habitable globe; and I felt a consciousness it was a comparatively easy affair for all good men, possessing the life of God in the soul, wherever they went into heathen climes, to teach the knowledge of God and his Christ. But great objections I felt to the *manner* in which all the present *expensive* efforts to evangelize the heathen are conducted. Knowing how *genteelly* they were generally provided for, with their provisions for *wives, children, and servants*, I could not but feel my mind rejecting the continued appeal to our feelings and sympathies, for their alleged *deprivations and sufferings*, in leaving fathers and mothers, and the comforts of *home* and civilization, for *the sake of the Gospel*. I could not but remember how many young men of our village were actually in distant lands, without money and without patronage, *voluntarily* submitting to their deprivations for the ordinary hope of gain. I thought that even in the same ships which wasted the missionaries comfortably, in well provided cabins, there were *our* relatives, common seamen before the mast, living on coarser fare, and habited in rougher garments, buffeting the elements, while the missionary family were soundly wrapt in sleep.

While preachers so vehemently exhort us to the duty of "*forsaking* all for the gospel's sake," and do so little of self-denial themselves, it reminds me of the Pharisees of old, who bound heavy burthens on others, while they themselves would not move them with one of their fingers. *I am a friend to evangelizing the world by missionaries*—but not such as now so ardently press into the service. I want to see them, *themselves*, "*hate* (or *forsake*) father and mother, and *wife and children*, for the gospel's sake," as St. Luke xiv. 26-32, expresses it. Let them once go abroad *without wives and children*, (thus showing at least some of the *selfdenial*

they preach) and I will give my aid cheerfully, as I formerly did, till I saw these *squanderings*, and the alms of the church lost in the *transportation of women, and children, and servants*! Look into any missionary accounts you will, and see the sums *dissipated* for these *unmissionary* purposes! How often do we see the whole expedition broken up, and *double* expenses incurred for the return of the missionary family, because of the sickness of the *wife*, or some of the *children*. How often, too, are we taxed with the children's education; (far above our children who contribute) who, because of the death of the father or the mother, are sent to us from Africa, from India, or from the Pacific! When I witness such waste of what the pious give solely for missionary labours, I can't but say, How can permanent good ensue? Do we not see that these *families*, prevent *true* missionaries from occupying their places?—And could we not send *ten* missionaries where we now send *one*, if this expensive appendage of missionary *indulgence* were not annexed? Are these indeed *self-denying men*, who yet have not *spirituality* enough of person, to be measurably dead to such sensual affections as thus eat up and devour the widows' mites, and the alms of the church?—Finally, I wonder, I deeply wonder, that missionaries themselves should not, in some moments of consideration, feel compunctions at seeing how their families were absorbing the hard collected dollars of the people! I am pained at their apathy! May God speedily endow his *spiritual* followers with a better spirit! or when more of common sense prevails, the name of *missionary* will become synonymous with *extortioner*.

BEREAN.

THE WISE MAN'S CHOICE.

"Choose you this day whom ye will serve."

Joshua xxiv. 15.

Mankind are always choosing or refusing. That is, acting as they are *acted upon*. If men have "*God in all their thoughts*," they will always act in reference to his commands, and their duty to their fellows. If God is only in *some* of their thoughts, they will *sometimes* act in reference to God, &c. And if "*God is not in all their thoughts*," they will not, at any time, conduct in the love and fear of God. Men, therefore, will choose to serve God, in the proportion that God is in their thoughts. Or they will serve the world, and the desires thereof, in proportion as the world is in their thoughts. Reader, it may be unpleasant, but as you are a party concerned, suppose you were to institute the inquiry for yourself; and examine what is in your thoughts, *God*, or the *world*? God's purpose, which has the good of *all* for its object; or the *world's* goods and honours, which are incompatible with the good of *all*, and have a part only for the object of pursuit. Reader, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve." Please to remember, that with all your *professions* to the contrary, you choose the *world*, and not God, whenever you obey the world instead of God.

Mankind deceive themselves grossly. Pretensions are mere chaff; and only calculated to impose

upon children, or those who are willing to become partners in iniquity, and to share the profits of the business. Tell me of your devotedness to God, to His cause, and of your religion and piety, and I will tell you of the God you worship, and show the mammon of this world to be uppermost in your choice, when you prefer the honour, the popularity, the riches, and varied goods of time and sense, to the commands of him who went about doing good; who gave even his *life* for his *enemies*. Show me the man, who will devote *one half* as much to his *God*, as he sacrifices to his *pride*; and I will show you a sinner, who, with all his imperfections, is in this day of general declension, almost good enough for a pattern for his fellows.

How long, how hard, are the struggles of men for riches, for power, for popularity, for a little pre-eminence over their fellows! What sacrifices are made! When a man chooses to serve the world, the devil, or, what is the same thing, himself, in opposition to the general good in conformity to God's command, it may rain or shine, blow high or blow low—he will, to use a vulgar phrase, "go through thick and thin," early and late, to effect a purpose which will torment him heartily for his pains. One half the expense and trouble in the good cause of God and humanity, would sweeten his reflections, and be like marrow to his bones. Alas! God promises fair, every one must acknowledge this; and if mankind were not such infidels, if they would trust and confide in Him, they would choose to serve Him, and not the world, the flesh, and the Devil.

The tongue is a wonderful member, and will promise to go, and will expatiate upon the advantages of working, in the vineyard of the Lord. But the man goes not. There are so many vineyards besides, that a man cannot work in all, at one and the same time; and where credit must be given for the labour, men choose to serve the world in the vineyard of honour or profit; because God is a poor paymaster. Surely this is your conclusion; or you would work for Him.

What is the great bustle about, that we see in the world? Fine houses, equipage and furniture.—Serving the Lord, to be sure. God commands us to do these things. Our honourable living and fame, proves us to be the meek and humble followers of the lowly Jesus. If this were true, it would be praise worthy. But we doubt it. Surely a man can be a good christian, without descending to the level of Christ's humility, or despising the allurements of the world, as he despised them. Why, friend, times have altered. So it appears. Lamentably altered, when religion consists in *words*, and men will sacrifice to pride and petulance, a hundred times as much as to truth and humanity.

An *excuse*, well framed, and persisted in, is as good as a duty performed. At least it would seem so, from the readiness of men to excuse themselves from doing those things which they acknowledge necessary and beneficial, and which they are able to perform. Is not this a distinguishing trait of christian character? Did not Christ frame excuses, and

say, If I do so, why men will say so and so; or I may suffer, &c. &c.? If he did, we do not know it. Did not Christ uniformly study to recommend himself to mankind, and to avoid every thing that would injure his popularity? No. Christ never was a timeserver. What a pity 'tis, men cannot serve God and the devil at the same time? What an accommodation it would be? Alas! Well, there is good company. It is all the fashion to serve the world. 'Tis only now and then you may be troubled by some despicable fellow, not worth a sixpence, perchance as great an offscouring of the earth, as was Paul and his compeers of old. *Money* makes the man. Pope said "*worth*." The same thing, differently expressed, for there is not any thing of "*worth*," *money* excepted. Therefore, men choose money, and they will serve the purposes of money.

Yet a *little* while, and the places that now know us, shall know us no more for ever. Ah, well, this may be the case, and the money, the thing called honour—it will gild your coffin, and lengthen the funeral procession. Besides, it will sooth a dying hour, to reflect, that while others have squandered their substance in doing good, you have saved the treasure, and can take it all, safe and sound, with you, into another world. If this could be done, there would be some excuse. What is a man's own approbation, a sense of well-doing, compared to the fame of public approbation? Is not "*a good name* rather to be chosen than riches?" and when we can have both, it is better still. Query. Is it the same thing, for a man to *possess* a good name, and to be called by a good name, *by* a popular faction? Christ had a good name. He deserved it. The execration of the universe could not alter it. The man who can feel elated, and make sacrifices, in the face of greater duties, to obtain the applause of the world, may rest assured, that he will eventually obtain a name as good as he deserves, and none better.

"Choose you this day whom you will serve." The gods of the world are around you. There is no middle course. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." If you value the applause and opinion of the *world*, be honest, in your idolatry, and no longer profess to serve that God, whose counsel you despise, and whose reproof you will have none of. Be "*cold or hot*." If you are "*luke warm*," you will be spued out of Christ's mouth. A middle course is out of the question. If you will save your life, step over on the other side. If you will lose your life, for Christ's sake, step into the ranks, and *keep there*. If you are afraid of losing your *reputation*, in the cause of the truth, touch not the armour, nor pollute the sacred helmet. "Like master, like man." Christ "*made himself of no reputation*." If you will keep your reputation, in the world's opinion, choose the *world*, and not risk so valuable a commodity to the keeping of your Maker. Be not disgraced as Christ was. He "*overcome the world*." If you undertake this conquest, your reputation may suffer, and your honour lie in the dust.

The wise man will be counselled; he will not despise the reproof. He will choose. His choice

once made, honour, popularity, fame, riches, every thing this world calls good and great, will in vain be presented to draw him away from the great object of his Saviour and his Judge. And if he is moved by a sincere Spirit, like that which dwelt in Jesus, honour and riches will be as little wanting to keep him in the field, as to bring him into it. His eye will be fixed on the cross. His heart, strengthened by the God of Jacob, will stand firm, whether the world smiles or frowns. It will never be asked, by him, What will men say? What will be the consequence to me, if I do thus? But, with a mind enlightened by the wisdom, and a heart warmed with the love which is from above, he will not turn to the right hand nor to the left; but move steadily on, in defiance of scorn, contumely, poverty, imprisonment, and death.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

BALFOUR'S INQUIRY.

A WORK with this title has just been issued from the press of George Davidson, Charlestown. It is a large octavo volume of 448 pages, and is very handsomely printed upon good paper. The writer of this article, in the little leisure time which has been allotted him since the work came out, has perused it, with a high degree of pleasure and profit. The path in which the writer has travelled has not received the impress of frequent footsteps. It is in many respects new; and this gives it additional interest.

It appears by the account the author has heretofore given, that he was first led to doubt the truth of the doctrine of endless misery, by reading Professor Stuart's Letters to Mr. (now Dr.) Channing. Mr. Balfour was much esteemed by his orthodox brethren; and it would be strange if there were not some things, which would have prevailed over a man of flexible principles, to excite a prejudice in favour of the doctrine of endless misery. The following extract from his work will be appropriate in this place. "How far I am correct," says he, "my readers must judge for themselves. I hope they will, on the one hand, guard against receiving my error, if it be one, and on the other, beware of rejecting my view, if true, from prejudices of *education*. Under the influences of these prejudices, I began to examine this subject, and have been obliged to relinquish my former views of Gehenna, from the force of the evidence I have already stated, and which I have yet to adduce on this subject." We here see what we seldom see—a man of learning, piety, and respectability, surrounded by his orthodox friends, with whom he had formed the most endearing associations, and whose affection for him, we trust, has not decreased; we see this man brought to doubt the truth of a doctrine he has advocated for years. And we see him sit down with the determination of knowing, if possible, whether he has long advocated truth or falsehood. Every thing conspires to induce him to give every argument brought in defence of the doctrine of punishment in the future state its greatest weight; and allow no argument in favour of the opposite doc-

trine more influence upon his mind, than it justly deserved. We see his prejudices in array against him. He says, in a communication to a correspondent published before the Inquiry, "I had formerly believed that Universal Salvation was a very pernicious error: Until I, therefore, had seen sufficient evidence to convince me, that I was mistaken, it would ill become a candid inquirer after Truth, not to use all proper means to avoid (believing) it." "On the other hand," says he, "I was not using means merely to avoid this, if it was an error, but was also using means to ascertain if this might not be true; and that I had formerly been mistaken." We have seen this man's prejudices run so high, as to induce him to say, "*I fear* that if I am an honest man, I must be an Universalist." After all, we have seen him pursue his inquiry until he was convinced that the doctrine he had before advocated was false. But now comes what would have been the bitterest part for some people, he avows his convictions to his congregation and the world. He says in the Inquiry, after having written at length concerning Matt. x. 28, and given his reasons for not believing that by Gehenna was meant a place of misery in the future state, "with such weight of evidence pressing on my mind, how could I do otherwise than honestly avow the convictions which this evidence has produced, without violating my conscience, and forfeiting all claims to an honest-minded man?"

We here have an instance of what the force of evidence will do with a man of principle. Who will not say that Mr. Balfour began his Inquiry under circumstances disadvantageous to Universalism? Who will say that he believed without evidence? Who can say that he did not give every objection to it the fullest consideration, and every argument against it its greatest weight? No pecuniary views could have the least influence to make him an Universalist. We must regard his conversion as a triumph of principle.

The Inquiry which Mr. Balfour has published consists of two chapters, divided into a number of sections. In the first section of the first chapter all those passages of scripture are considered, in which the Hebrew word *Sheol* occurs, which is rendered, in the common version, *pit*, *grave*, and *hell*. It is here distinctly shown, by a variety of clear and striking arguments, that *Sheol* had no reference to a place of punishment in a future state. We should be happy to quote many of these arguments in this place, but we hope the readers of the Magazine will all avail themselves of the privilege of reading the work. In this part of his inquiry, he says, "another fact, equally certain is, that not only are the words eternal, everlasting, or for ever, omitted in speaking of *Sheol*, or *hell*, but this place is not spoken about as a place of misery, at all. Whether *Sheol* is translated pit, grave, or hell, in not one of the passages, is it described as a place of misery or punishment for the wicked, or for any one else. Before there need be any dispute, whether the punishment in this place is to be of eternal duration, we have got first to prove, *that it is a place of punishment.*"

The next section of this chapter is devoted to the consideration of all the passages of scripture in which the Greek word *Hades* occurs. This word answers to the Hebrew *Sheol*. In translating *Sheol*, the LXX have almost invariably used *Hades*. *Hades* occurs just eleven times in the New Testament, and is rendered, in the common version, once grave, and ten times hell. Mr. Balfour contends that this word originally had no reference to a place of future torment. The account of the rich man in Luke xvi, 23, he contends is a parabolic representation. He admits that our Lord might here allude to what he calls the heathen notion of punishment after death, but not to recognise this notion as truth, any more than he recognised the god mammon, when he said, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon;" or Paul the doctrine of witchcraft, when he said, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?" or any more than we, when we say, such an one has got St. Anthony's fire, another St. Vitu's dance, recognise the influence of these saints in producing these disorders. He contends that the Jews got their notion of future punishment from the heathen, in proof of which he adduces a luminous quotation from Dr. Campbell, in the third section of this chapter. After considering all the passages in which *Hades* occurs, Mr. B. says, "These are all the passages in which the New Testament writers use the word *Hades*, and which is once translated grave, and ten times hell in the common version. We think all must admit that it is never used to express a place of endless misery; and some evidence has been given that it is never used to express a place of punishment of any kind."

(Concluded in our next.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I should be much pleased if you would express your opinion in the Gospel Herald, relative to the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. I mean, whether you consider the Scriptures as authorizing the observance of them since the apostolic age. My only motive in making this request is a desire to gain information, and to be set right in error.

E. P. A.

REPLY.

Our opinion can be expressed in few words; also, the evidence we consider as satisfactory. It is evident that *Baptism* was observed, and practised upon Jewish converts, and, in some few instances, upon Gentile converts, during the time that transpired from the advent and preaching of Christ, unto the destruction of Jerusalem, and end of the Mosaic dispensation. But, even then, we find Paul, who was sent to the Gentiles, omitting the use and observance of this ordinance, as it is called; and thanking God that he had baptized only two or three, &c. Affirming that "Christ sent him *not to baptize*, but to *preach* the Gospel." (1 Cor. i. 17.) We consider this conclusive.

We believe the ordinance called the *Lord's supper*, to be the *Jewish* passover; and binding on all Jews and Christians, until Christ came in the glory of his Father, made an end of the dispensation of

types and shadows, and introduced the New-Jerusalem, or gospel of the kingdom. (See Matt. x. 23; xvi. 27, 28. Luke xxi.) The passover, which was instituted in Egypt, was typical of Christ. The observance of this showed forth his death, until he came, when the Mosaic dispensation, and all its types, (and the passover was one of them,) were abolished.

Would to Heaven that Christians were anxiously solicitous to show forth their *Lord's life*, by imitating his forbearance, love, and mercy. By doing good, feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked. It is to be feared, that the observance of ceremonies has a direct tendency to lessen the desire of the performance of more solid and beneficial duties. The command is often repeated, to administer to the necessitous; to love even our enemies. The command is not equivocal. It is attended with more *expense*, and less *show* and parade, than the outward ordinance of the passover; and is in consequent *disrepute*. If Christians would omit forms and parade, and instead of pampering their *own* pride, and the pride of *self-styled Reverend* clergymen, were to imitate the apostles of Christ, and on the first day of the week inquire into the *wants* of *their poor brethren*, and administer to their necessities, they would then be in *reality* what, it is to be feared, many now are only by *profession*.

But we judge no man. "Let every man be persuaded in *his own mind*." We shall think and believe for ourselves; and, we trust, always have charity that we may extend the same privilege to others.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Sir—I find I have been mistaken, and consider myself under obligations to you, not only for the trouble I have put you to, but, for convincing me that I was so. There are, however, other passages in the Bible, that appear to me contradictory, which (when I shall peruse them carefully, and if they still appear contradictory) I will trouble you for an explanation of. That a belief in the truth of any book is necessary to a proper understanding of it, I am not, at present, willing to concede. If the Bible is in fact, a revelation from God to man, it is not my wish to believe it contradictory. If it is harmonious, all I want is to find it so.

I do not wish to put you to the trouble of inserting this in the Herald, but if you deem it necessary, I have no objections. Yours, respectfully, L.

New-York, March 9, 1824.

Note—We insert the above as an act of justice; conceiving that next to the honour of being infallible, (which no man can claim,) is that of a candid acknowledgment of having been mistaken. Man's pre-eminence over his fellow, in wisdom and knowledge, is never sufficient to authorize him to glory. So long as there is any thing to learn, the wisest man is ignorant. All are in pursuit of truth; and the wise man will accept of truth only. It will be characteristic of the greatest folly, to accept of error in the stead of truth, and to keep the error, and value it not according to its worth, but to the trouble it has caused us.

ED.

From the Evangelical Intelligencer.

MAHOMETAN CREED.

I believe in the books which have been delivered to the prophets. In this manner was the Koran delivered to Mahomet, the Pentateuch to Moses, the Psalter to David, and the Gospel to Jesus. I believe in the prophets, and the miracles which they performed. Adam was the first prophet, and Mahomet the last. I believe that for the space of fifty thousand years, the righteous shall repose under the shade of the terestial paradise, and the wicked shall be exposed to the burning rays of the sun. I believe in the bridge Sirat, which passes over the bottomless pit of Hell; it is as fine as a hair, and sharp as a sabre. All must pass over it, and the wicked shall be thrown off. I believe in the water pools of Paradise. Each of the prophets has in Paradise, a bason for his own use; the water is whiter than milk, and sweeter than honey. On the ridges of the pools are vessels to drink out of, and they are bordered with stars. I believe in Heaven and Hell; the inhabitants of the former know no want, and the Houris who attend them are never afflicted with sickness. The floor of Paradise is musk, the stones are silver, and the cement gold. The damned are, on the contrary, tormented with fire, and by voracious, and poisonous animals.

Selected.

THE OFFSPRING OF MERCY.

When the Almighty was about to create man, he summoned before him the angels of his attributes, the watchers of his dominion. They stood in council around his hidden throne.

"Create him not," said the angel of Justice; "he will not be equitable to his brethren, he will oppress the weaker."

"Create him not," said the angel of Peace; "he will manure the earth with human blood; the first-born of his race will be the slayer of his brother."

"Create him not," said the angel of Truth; "he will defile thy sanctuary with falsehood, although thou shouldest stamp on his countenance thine image, the seal of confidence."

So spake the angels of the attributes of Jehovah; when Mercy, the youngest and dearest child of the Eternal, arose, and clasping his knees, "Create him, Father," said she, "in thy likeness, the darling of thy loving-kindness. When all thy messengers forsake him, I will seek and support him, and turn his faults to good. Because he is weak, I will incline his bowels to compassion, and his soul to atonement. When he departs from peace, from truth, from justice, the consequences of his wanderings shall deter him from repeating them, and shall gently lead him to amendment."

The Father of all gave ear, and created man, a weak, faltering being; but in his faults the pupil of Mercy, the son of ever-active and meliorating Love.

Remember thine origin, O man! when thou art hard and unkind towards thy brother. Mercy alone willed thee to be: Love and Pity suckled thee at their bosoms.

BILL OF MORTALITY.

The number of deaths in this city, the past year, were 3,444. Of this number, 1,962 were Males, and 1,482 Females. Adult Males, 1,007. Adult Females, 734. *Children*, of both sexes, 1,703. Therefore, the deaths in this city, the past year, were, wanting a fraction, *one half* of the whole number, *children*; most of them in *very infancy*. Christians of every sect, *cruel Calvinists* excepted, will charitably allow these *infants* a place in Heaven.

The number of coloured persons who died the past year, and are included in the above estimate, were 492, being about *one eighth* of the entire deaths in the city.

Of diseases, *Consumption* stands foremost, and claims the first rank in the work of death. No less than 683 fell victims to this exterminating foe, in this city, during the year 1823.

Measles proved the past year, a fatal disease among children. *One hundred and seventeen* fell victims to this complaint; and only *one* the year preceding.

The deaths the past year, average the weekly number of *sixty-six*. Taking the number of deaths the past year as a criterion, and the population of the city 127,108, it will allow 37 years to a *generation*.

Among the *unnecessary* deaths, were *forty-three* of *intemperance*; which cannot be classed with any disease that flesh is heir to. It is a *new-fashioned*, and *artificial* way of "shuffling off this mortal coil."

The number of deaths in Philadelphia, the past year, were 4,600; an excess over this city, of 1,156. New-York is more populous than Philadelphia, and evidently more healthy.

THE ATONEMENT.

Professor Murdock, of Andover Theological Seminary, in a discourse on the Atonement, recently published, rejects the doctrine of Christ's vicarious satisfaction, or that he became our sponsor and suffered in our stead: and affirms that the bloody sacrifice of the Mediator was not what the law of God demanded, or could accept as a legal satisfaction for our sins—that it did not cover over or conceal the sins of the transgressor, nor cancel any claims of the law on him—that, after the atonement was made, God was under no legal obligation to exempt any man from punishment, and if he pardons at all, it is mere grace. *Hampshire Gazette.*

TAKE THE SCALP.

"A gentleman from Cornwall informed and assures us as truth, that when the Cherokee, lately married at that place, was asked what he thought of some strong and pointed remarks made by a man, against his marrying a white girl, replied, '*If I called myself a savage, I would go hundreds of miles to take the scalp of that man.*' Enough of civilization to know, that without that '*if*,' he would have been arrested for a threat—enough of the savage left, to have his *first* thoughts turn instantly to a

scalp. The sweet and *only* revenge of a *scalp*, is thought of, and that for only expressing indignation at his marrying a white girl." *Amer. Eagle.*

ANECDOTE.

In a conversation on the subject of "the common salvation," a limitarian was overpowered by the arguments of his antagonist, and fled to the last and fashionable resort. "Your doctrine," said he, "is very good to live by, but it will not do to die by." "Very well," replied his opponent, "I will then use my doctrine while I live, and embrace one suitable to my state afterwards. Yours is good for nothing to live by, but, as you say, good to die by. It will be sound policy, in my opinion, for both of us to follow my doctrine while we live, and not to meddle with yours till we come to die."

REMARKS.

It appears to me to be sound policy indeed. The doctrine of endless torment is in every respect untenable in the ordinary intercourse of social life. It is not at all suitable to the relations and duties of the present state. Unlike almanacs which are fitted to one latitude, but will serve without any material variation for others, this monstrous sentiment, to be suitable to social man, must undergo an infinite variation. And for one, I am determined to cherish a more congenial doctrine, till, unfortunately, as orthodoxy would term it, I arrive in those frosty regions of misanthropy, in which this scorching tenet will be convenient and comfortable. *Chris. Intel.*

IF.

It appears there is only an *if* in the way, or the Indian Missionary would go to the old trade of *scalping*. So said a Doctor of Divinity in this city, "*If I was not a clergyman, I would kick you out of my house.*" There is a savour of the Old man of sin discoverable in these gentlemen.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"What think ye of Christ?—Matt. xxii. 42.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

¶ We are requested to say, that our Br. King will preach in Morristown, (N. J.) a week from to-morrow, March 21st.

BALFOUR'S INQUIRY.

We have last week received a number of copies of "An Inquiry into the Scripture import of the words SHEOL, HADES, TARTARUS, and GEHENNA; all translated HELL, in the common English Version. By Walter Balfour, Charlestown," (Mass.) There are a few copies extra, after Subscribers are supplied, which can be purchased at this office. Also, For Sale—"Ballou's Eleven Sermons."

¶ Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1824.

NO. 45.

BALFOUR'S INQUIRY.

(Concluded from p. 350.)

The third section is devoted to the consideration of 2 Peter ii. 4, in which, and which only, the word *Tartarus* occurs. Dr. Campbell observes that the Jews, after their intercourse with the heathen, came to conceive of Hades as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters. They did not receive of the heathen the term *Elysium*, to signify those parts of Hades peopled by good spirits, but they used the word *Paradise*, and the phrase Abraham's bosom. But they did not decline the use of the word *Tartarus*. By this they signified that part of Hades in which evil spirits were confined. If we can believe Dr. Campbell, it is indisputable that the Jews learned their doctrine of punishment in Hades from the heathens with whom they had intercourse. The word *Tartarus*, as we have hinted, occurs but once in the Bible, and then in one of those books whose genuineness, says Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. had been disputed by the early christian writers. Dr. Lardner says of these disputed books, "They should be allowed to be publicly read in Christian Assemblies, for the edification of the people, but not to be alleged as affording alone sufficient proof of any doctrine." Lardner's Hist. of the Apostles, vol. i. ch. ii. The authors of the improved version say, "Some have thought the 1st and 3d chapters (of the 2d epistle of Peter) genuine, but from the difference of style have doubted of the second." In a note on 2d Peter ii. 4, in which *Tartarus* occurs, they further say—"1. The epistle itself is of doubtful authority. 2. From the change of style this is the most doubtful portion of the epistle. 3. By those who admit the genuineness of the epistle, this chapter is supposed to have been a quotation from some ancient apocryphal book, and the apostle might not mean to give authority to the doctrine, but to argue with his readers upon known and allowed principles. See Sherlock's Diss. and Benson and Doddridge's Introductions to this epistle." If Peter was the author of the passage to which this note belongs, he may have used *Tartarus* emblematically, without any intention to recognise the notions of the heathen as true. Our Lord, undoubtedly, in the parable of the rich man, uses Hades in this way. As the heathen used *Tartarus*, it might be made a striking emblem of darkness. They looked upon it as a deep dark place. Hesiod represents it as black *Tartarus*. We find it called in Pope's translation of Homer, "the deep Tartarean gulf," and "murky *Tartarus*." The apostle speaks of delivering the angels that sinned "into chains of darkness," which the au-

thors of the improved version interpret to mean, "judicial blindness of mind." The doctrine of future punishment, so important as it is represented to be, would not we think, if true, be rested upon such a proof as this. At any rate, we do not feel satisfied to receive it upon such "precarious evidence." As orthodox writers acknowledge that *Tartarus* does not refer to a place of endless punishment, it was not necessary in the Inquiry, that much time should be spent in ascertaining whether it referred to that. After making an interesting quotation from M. Le Clerc's religion of the ancient Greeks, Mr. Balfour says, "2d. From the above quotation it appears, that though punishment after death in *Tartarus* was believed by the heathen generally, yet the better informed among them did not believe "in the fables of hell," but turned them into ridicule. Juvenal took no part in those opinions of the vulgar; and Virgil says—"it was the province of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, riveted by education." Is it not then strange, that a doctrine, which was invented by heathens, and treated with contempt by their own wisest men, should be a fundamental article in the faith of Christians? How is this to be accounted for? 3d, I may just add, that when the heathen were made converts to the Christian faith, all allow that many of their previous notions were soon incorporated with it. This, together with the erroneous views held by the Jewish converts, laid a foundation for such a corruption of Christianity, which, if it were not attested by evidence indisputable, could not be believed. That punishment in Hades, or *Tartarus*, after death, is not a part of this corruption of Christianity derived from the heathen, at least deserves to be seriously considered. The evidence we have adduced, proving that it is, we submit to the reader's judgment. To conclude this chapter, We have shown, that neither Sheol, Hades, nor *Tartarus*, is ever used by the sacred writers to signify a place of endless misery for the wicked. This was all we were bound to do, in opposing the common opinion on this subject. But we have also shown, that this opinion originated with the heathen; and that the Jews learned it from them. To invalidate the evidence which has been produced, the very reverse must be proved."

The latter section concludes the first chapter of the Inquiry. The second chapter is divided into seven sections. In the first, are remarks upon Dr. Campbell's views of Gehenna; in the second and fourth, a number of striking and interesting facts are stated, "showing that Gehenna was not used by the New Testament writers to express a place of

endless misery?" In the third all those passages of scripture in which Gehenna occur, are considered: In the fifth, "the argument arising from the Apocrypha and Targums, in favour of endless misery in Gehenna or Hell," is considered: The sixth is devoted to the answering of objections—and the seventh to the author's concluding remarks.

The remarks upon Dr. Campbell's views of Gehenna are made in the spirit of charity. Yet the subject is deeply penetrated, and the Dr.'s inconsistencies are clearly pointed out. In the latter part of the section where these remarks are found, the true sense in which the Old Testament writers use *Gehinnom* (Gehenna) or tophet, is shown. Remark upon its emblematic use, Mr. B. says, "It is evident that they made tophet an emblem of punishment, and of future punishment, but, not of future eternal punishment in another state of existence. This all will admit without any hesitation. It is equally evident that they made it an emblem of future temporal punishment to the Jews as a nation. Not a word is dropped that this punishment was to be in a future state of existence, or of eternal duration. No; it is a punishment of a temporal nature, in this world. It is a prediction of miseries to be endured by the Jews, for their sins. It is not mentioned as a punishment for wicked men generally, or for Jews and Gentiles indiscriminately. No; the Jews, and they as a nation, were to suffer this punishment." By a comparison of our Saviour's celebrated prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, with quotations from Jeremiah, Mr. Balfour makes it appear perfectly evident, that Jeremiah used tophet as an emblem of the very miseries of which our Saviour prophesied; thus illustrating Christ's awful interrogation to the Jews, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?"

The facts contained in the second and fourth sections prove, we should think beyond controversy, that Gehenna was not used by the sacred writers to express a place of punishment in the future state.

The facts contained in these two sections are very strong evidence that Gehenna has no reference at all to punishment in another world. And when we review the section where all those passages in which Gehenna occurs are considered, the evidence of this appears irresistible. Concerning Matt. xxiii. 33, Mr. B. says, "It is now seen that the context of this passage leads us, not to interpret the words 'damnation of hell,' of punishment in a future state, but of the temporal calamities coming on the Jewish nation, during that generation. If ever the context of any passage decided in what sense the writer used a word or phrase, it is entirely decided in the one before us."

In the fifth section, as we have said, the arguments arising from the Apocrypha and Targums, in favour of endless misery in Gehenna is considered. It is rather laughable that the Apocrypha should be quoted to establish the use of Gehenna, when the word is not found in it. Gehenna is found in the Targums. But are we sure that the Targumists used Gehenna for a place of future misery?

Is this certain? Let any one read Ruth ii. 12, and Isaiah xxxiii. 14, the places in the Targums to which Whitby and Parkhurst refer us, and see if he can make this out certainly. If they did use Gehenna to signify a place of eternal misery, the people had not learned this sense from them at the time of our Lord's ministry. For the Targums were not written until about the time of Christ. From Prideaux we learn, that the Jewish writers say that Onkelos who was the author of the most ancient Targum, assisted at the funeral of Gamaliel, who was Paul's master, so that the Targums could not have been written long before Christ. The Jews then could not have been liable to understand Christ by Gehenna, to mean a place of future punishment. The reader must consult the Inquiry for the best of ideas upon this subject. His time will not be unprofitably spent. The consideration of objections, and the conclusion of the work constitute the contents of the sixth and seventh which are the last sections in this chapter, and in the book. Some new objections are started, and some old ones answered with new and striking thoughts. We cheerfully recommend the whole work to the candid attention of the religious community. We recommend it to our friends and our opponents. The candid man who believes in a hell in the future state, must find his faith shaken before he gets through. We do not expect to see any answer to this book; but if we do, we hope to see its important arguments considered; the body of its subject taken up; we hope to see the sense of the inspired writers sought for, in their use of the words, *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, and *Gehenna*. We wish the writer a full reward for his labours, not only in a pecuniary, but moral point of view: May he see his book do much good in the religious world.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.
LIFE OF DR. CHAUNCY.

CHARLES CHAUNCY, D. D. was born at Boston, (Mass.) on the 1st of January, 1705. His father was a merchant, who, it appears, passed though a short life with little or no share in the public attention. Some of his more remote ancestors, however, were considerably known in their day. Isaac, his grandfather, succeeded to the pastoral care of Dr. Owen's church in London; in which he was assisted, during the three last years of his ministry by the celebrated Dr. Watts, then his colleague. He became somewhat distinguished as a zealous writer against Neonomianism. Charles, the great-grandfather of the Doctor, was the second president of the college in Cambridge, Mass. He was a man of great learning; but of contracted views and puritanical sentiments.

Of Chauncy's early life, the account we have is so defective, that all we know of him, from his birth to his settlement in Boston, is, that he lost his father when he was about seven years old; that he entered Cambridge college at the age of twelve, and took the degree of master of arts at nineteen.

In 1727, he was ordained over the First Church

in Boston, as colleague to the Rev. Thomas Foxcroft. It is probable that, at this time, he had not acquired the reputation of extraordinary abilities, as the church were far from being unanimous in their vote of invitation. His talents were not such as are obvious to a cursory glance; nor were they of a kind to attain an early maturity. As a public speaker, he never did become popular; for although he often manifested an earnestness that made a good impression on his hearers, and, in some critical cases, evinced an intrepidity in the advancement of truth, which commanded universal respect, yet his manner was never sufficiently impassioned to excite rapture, nor, in general, so interesting as to engage the unwearied attention of an audience. However, it must have given him but very little uneasiness that he was not distinguished as a speaker, if the opinion he professed to entertain of that character was cordial, and not the result of chagrin; for it is said that, in the company of intimate friends, he sometimes besought God never to make him an *orator*: a prayer that heaven was pleased to grant. We may certainly justify the contempt in which he held all the apish tricks of artificial oratory; but it is by no means to the credit of his taste that he seemed to indulge an aversion towards the genuine eloquence of nature itself.

We cannot now discover any traces of Chauncy's influence during some years after his settlement in Boston; unless we attribute to him several improvements that were made in the established regulations of the church, about this period. The church alone had hitherto held the entire management of the concerns of the whole society; but in 1730, they invited the congregation to share in all votes respecting either the raising or appropriation of money. About the same time, the church dispensed with the rule which required all candidates for membership to give in a relation of their *experiences*, as they are called. The next year, (1731) the privilege of baptism was extended to the children of those parents, who, though not communicants, had solemnly owned what has since been termed the *half-way covenant*. These improvements, though inconsiderable, are indications of an increasing liberality of thought and feeling; and whether they were produced solely by the good sense of the church, countenanced by the example of a few others, or effected by the exertions of Chauncy, they must have been very grateful to a mind blest, like his, with a freedom from bigotry and superstition, to a degree, which, however imperfect, exceeded what was common at his day.

During the first fourteen or fifteen years of his ministry, he published about a dozen sermons; which, though they contain nothing very particular as to doctrine, exhibit some traces of a strong genius, moving on its way, without much deference to etiquette or popular opinion. They are composed, however, in the barbarous style common to that period, with little care in the choice of words, and little attention to the form and arrangement of sentences. He had as little ambition for the reputation of a fine writer, as for that of an orator.

"He accordingly entered on his task," says Emerson, "whether of composing or delivery, without much nerve, as a labourer commences his daily toil, uttering a deal of common truth in a common way. But he had always a design which he kept clearly and steadily in view, until it was prudently and thoroughly executed."

About the year 1736, an incident occurred which directed his attention to the controversy between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, concerning the order of bishops and power of ordaining. To this he applied himself with a determination to become thoroughly acquainted with the authority and reasons which are urged for the high pretensions of Episcopacy. He read the works of the Fathers, and every other book on the subject, which he could find in the libraries in Boston and that at Cambridge. In this study he spent *four years* of more intense application, according to his own account, than he could ever sustain afterwards. The result was the collection of materials for his "*Complete View of Episcopacy*," which remained unpublished nearly thirty years; and of a great number of extracts from different works, which evidently proved of so much service to him, when he came to be engaged in his controversy with Dr. Chandler.

Scarcely was this fatiguing course of study completed, when he was called to act a part more conspicuous, and not less laborious: the part of a public champion for sober and rational religion, amidst the wild enthusiasm of *New Lights*. For some years there had been, in many parts of New-England, a remarkable succession of those superstitious phrensies, miscalled *revivals of religion*; and in 1739, they began to spread extensively along the sea-board of the middle and southern states (then Colonies) under the preaching of the celebrated Mr. Whitfield, who had just arrived in this country. Some of the most respectable ministers of Boston, hearing of Whitfield's extraordinary success at the southward, sent him, in 1740, a pressing invitation to visit Boston, whose inhabitants had not yet been roused to a sense of their horrible insecurity under the care of their Creator. Whitfield immediately came. The people hailed his approach as that of a messenger from heaven, to whom was committed the eternal welfare of their souls, and whose labours were to instate them in the favour of their God. He was met on his way by the governor's son and many of the Clergy, attended by numbers of the principal inhabitants, and in this pompous manner conducted into town. The fuel was already prepared, and needed only the application of his torch to set it in a blaze. He was in Boston scarcely three weeks; but in this short period, his fervid eloquence and captivating manner, aided by the zealous co-operation of the clergy, and perhaps still more by the favourable pre-disposition of the people, completely succeeded in inspiring the public mind with his own enthusiasm. The fire broke out on every hand, and soon mingled with the general conflagration which began to rage from Maine to Georgia. The years 1741 and 1742, were the time of the most extensive and general *awakening* (to use a cant term,)

that was ever experienced in this country. There was but here and there a place left exempt from its influence.* The people, throughout the country, were daily flocking to their ministers, to have their spiritual condition ascertained; or crowding to weekly lectures, where the outcries of terror, the sobs of anguish, and the swoonings of ecstasy bred such a disturbance as often to prevent the preacher from being heard, and in some cases obliged him to leave his discourses unfinished. To increase the phrensy, a new set of fanatics spread through the country, and perfected this wild work with extravagancies so enormous, and irregularities so alarming, as to be condemned even by a part of the adherents of Whitfield.

Such was the state of the country, when Chauncy, in his uncourtly way, stood forth to recall the public mind from its dangerous delirium. He stood almost alone in the attempt. There were many, indeed, who wished him success; but they dared not manifest their favour openly. His particular friends generally shrunk from the hazard of supporting or vindicating him. Foxcroft, his father in the ministry, was an apologist† for Whitfield, whom he had invited to preach in his desk. All this neither daunted nor discouraged Chauncy; while the faint-hearted ventured only to lament the excesses of the time under the soft appellation of *improprieties*, he insisted that they were "things of a bad and dangerous tendency; and that the prevailing excitement, from which they arose, was, in general, but a delusion. To prepare himself for opposing it successfully, he took a journey through Connecticut, where the mania was the most violent; and established a correspondence with several eminent men in almost every part of New-England. While at New-Haven, in the beginning of 1742, he wrote a particular *Account of the French Prophets*,‡ in a letter to a friend in Boston. This little work was

* The ministers of the association of New-Haven county, Conn. opposed the awakening, and adopted decided, and perhaps tyrannical, measures to suppress it. There were also some other ministers in Connecticut, and some in Massachusetts, who in their individual capacity opposed it.

† In 1740, Mr. Foxcroft published "A sermon, occasioned by the labours and visits of Mr. Whitfield:" and in 1745, a warm "Apology for Mr. Whitfield."

‡ A sect of fanatics which sprung up in France, 1688, and soon became very numerous. In 1706, some of them came to England, where they drew great multitudes after them, and infected many, of all ages and characters, with their disordered imagination. They had strange fits, which came upon them with tremblings and faintings, as a swoon. They remained a while in trances, and coming out of them with twitchings, uttered all which came into their mouths. Whatever they said on these occasions, was received with the utmost reverence, as being the words of divine inspiration. The burden of their prophecy was, "Amend your lives; repent ye; for the end of all things is at hand." They prophesied that within three years, the wicked should be exterminated from the earth, the first resurrection take place, and the millennial state commence. They prophesied also that Dr. Emes, one

well calculated for the times; and it would, even now, be useful and interesting, as it describes most of the fanatical sects which have prevailed since the Christian era, and shews that their spirit and manners have been much the same in all ages. After his return to Boston, he published, in the same year, a sermon on *Enthusiasm*;* in which he endeavoured to describe the various operations and appearances of a heated imagination. This is considered a happy production. To it was prefixed *A Letter*, of rather boisterous reproof, to James Davenport, an itinerant preacher, who, though crazy, had uncommon success, it was thought, in making people wise unto salvation. But the work which cost Chauncy the most pains, and made the greatest clamour among the enthusiasts of the day, was an octavo volume that he published this year; the design and plan of which will be readily understood by the title-page: "Seasonable thoughts on the state of religion in New-England; a treatise in five parts. I. Faithfully pointing out the things of a bad and dangerous tendency in the late and present religious appearance in the land. II. Representing the obligations that lie upon the pastors of these churches in particular, and upon all in general, to use their endeavours to suppress prevailing disorders; with the great danger of a neglect in so important a matter. III. Opening in many instances, wherein the discouragers of irregularities have been injuriously treated. IV. Shewing what ought to be corrected or avoided in testifying against the evil things of the present day. V. Directing our thoughts more positively to what may be judged the best expedients to promote pure and undefiled religion in these times. With a preface, giving an account of the Antinomians, Familists, and Libertines, who infected these churches above an hundred years ago; very needful for these days; the like spirit and errors prevailing now, as did then. The whole being intended and calculated to serve the interest of Christ's kingdom." Emerson says that this work had a very extensive circulation; and that it is even now perused with pleasure and

of their number who had died, should rise from the dead, on the 25th of May, 1708, between noon and 6 o'clock, P. M.; and several other things which never came to pass. They pretended to the gift of languages, of discerning the secrets of the heart, the gift of ministering the same spirit to others by the laying on of their hands, and the gift of healing, &c. &c. Notwithstanding all these extravagancies, there were among them those who seemed to be men of good discernment and information, and of a perfectly sound mind in relation to every thing except religion. They made the most solemn appeals to God, for the reality of their visions, agitations, impulses and ecstasies; and were undoubtedly perfectly sincere.

* In this sermon, he, for the first time, affixed to his name the title of D.D. which degree he received this year (1742) from the University of Edinburgh.

† In the latter part of this treatise, Chauncy bestowed a very free examination on a work which the Rev. Mr. Edwards of Northampton (afterwards president of New-Jersey college) had just published in favour of the *awakenings*.

improvement by all the lovers of rational religion. It is certainly of great value as a faithful representation of the enthusiasm of the day; but it ought not, perhaps, to receive indiscriminate commendation. As a treatise it wants succinctness, which is the case with Chauncy's works in general; and in pointing out "the things of a bad and dangerous tendency," the author seems to treat the practice of itinerating and preaching in other minister's parishes as the most reprehensible of all. A practice which can plead, in its support, the example of Christ and his apostles, as well as of most reformers, should not be indiscriminately condemned, notwithstanding its impropriety under certain circumstances. As this Book contained several free animadversions on Whitfield's conduct and views, nearly two years after its appearance Whitfield published a *Letter to Chauncy*, complaining of misrepresentation in some instances, defending himself in others, and making slight concessions. Chauncy immediately published a *Letter in reply*,* which is a masterly specimen of acuteness, and strong, authoritative reproof delivered with unaffected candour. It was a sort of opposition that Whitfield's artful genius could not cope with. In addition to the labour and care of his own publications, Chauncy had the revision or inspection of the larger part of what was written by others against the spirit of the times.

(To be continued.)

"SAYBROOK PLATFORM."

We have sometimes had occasion to speak of the "Saybrook Platform," and in a few instances presented our readers with extracts from this precious mass of divinity. In so doing we incurred the displeasure of some who are not so orthodox as their creed makers; the words "Saybrook Platform" seemed rather grating to their ears, and they denied that they either believed it, or that it was recognised by the Orthodox Church at the present time.

This system of faith having been recently acknowledged as sound, and a belief of it indispensably necessary to qualify a preacher for the duties required of him; we shall again exhibit to our readers some of the excellencies of this system. This has been elicited more particularly at this time, in consequence of what occurred a few days since, on the examination of a young minister preparatory to his ordination as pastor over a society in this city. We will make a little digression, that we may touch lightly upon this catechetical examination, which was probably a little amusing if not edifying to the spectators, especially, as many very novel as well as important questions were asked and answered, likewise many mysterious and incomprehensible points of faith were elucidated, and those things which have been thought most incongruous and irreconcilable, were made to harmonize most admirably well. The most important question, probably, was the one asked by the late Pastor.

Quest.—Do you believe (or can you give your assent to) what is vulgarly called the Saybrook Platform?

Ans.—Yes.

The catechist observed that the fraternity had deemed it necessary to require an assent to this system of clerical ingenuity and wisdom, before a minister was duly authorized to preach the gospel as professed by the brethren of the faith.—It seems therefore that this old, antiquated and mystical mass of inconsistencies, is still to be the test, or a prerequisite, and indispensably necessary to qualify one for the holy office of minister of the gospel, and enable him to have good fellowship with the defenders of the faith as once delivered to the saints.

This system probably was what another Rev. gentleman of this city had in view when he spoke of the fundamentals of Christianity, as it undoubtedly contains all the fundamental as well as particular tenets of the order. The young gentleman was asked, whether he believed in a God, and to furnish evidence of his existence. Whether it was supposed that he entertained doubts on this subject, or whether it was for form sake, it is not known; yet could he have been recognized as the minister of any sect without this belief, and had he not for a long time been preaching and inculcating the idea that all creation was the production of a Supreme Being, perhaps it would not have so much astonished the spectators: whether he was distinctly asked if he believed in the immortality of the soul, we have not been informed: it is however presumed not. Whether the belief of a God, or a belief in the Platform is most essential as a matter of faith, may be somewhat doubtful. It however appeared that not less than one God should be acknowledged, yet he should exist in three separate and distinct persons; for then we have a God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy Ghost, all possessing the same attributes, and equally alike in degree; consequently all must possess the various attributes in an infinite degree, neither subordinate to the other. Why he was not instructed in presenting his petitions, to address the omnipotent, and indivisible God the Holy Ghost, we are left to conjecture.

Whether faith or repentance takes precedence, or how nearly allied repentance and conversion are, were probably important questions; especially very important when it was declared that those who are saved, are saved by the elective grace of God, chosen in the covenant of mercy, as agreed upon by the three persons in the sacred Trinity, and thereby saved from the vengeance consequent on a violated law, by the mediatorial interposition of the second person in the trinity, who offered himself as a victim to save the elect.

It was gratifying to find that God's irrevocable decrees with respect to the conduct and ultimate end of man, were perfectly reconcilable with the agency and volition which he possesses, and that the infinite benevolence of God and the eternal misery of his children were likewise perfectly reconcilable.

A very weighty question in these troublesome

* According to Emerson, Chauncy published two letters to Whitfield; one in 1744, the other in 1745. I suspect, however, that his account is incorrect. He says that he had never seen either of the letters.

times was asked by a modern apostle. The question (in substance) was, whether it would be a duty to dissolve the holy bands which bind brethren of one faith (Calvinistic) together, and withhold the fellowship which had been exercised towards each other, should any of the fundamental tenets be given up, such as the divinity of Christ, &c.?

As a brother has recently had independence of mind sufficient to examine this subject, and publish the result of his investigations, to the regret of our good orthodox divines, perhaps it was proper to know what course ought to be taken with respect to him, or whether the course already taken be thought justifiable.

We now invite the attention of our readers to a few extracts from this system of faith, and let them judge of their merits. At a future time we may perhaps make further extracts with remarks thereon.



Chap. III. Art. 3.—“By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death.”

Art. 4.—“These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.”

Art. 5.—“Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto, and all to the praise of his glorious grace.”

Chap. X. Art. 2.—“This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.”

Art. 3.—“Elect infants dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, who worketh when and where, and how he pleaseth; so also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.”

Chap. XI. Art. 4.—“God did from all eternity agree to justify all the elect, and Christ did in the fulness of time die for their sins, and rise again for their justification: nevertheless they are not justified personally until the holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them.” *Relig. Inq.*

From the (Buffalo) Gospel Advocate.

CHRIST'S COMING TO JUDGMENT.

A Lecture on 2 Thess. i. 6-10. delivered at Rochester, (N. Y.) Nov. 24th, 1823, by Brother J. S. THOMPSON.

Since I have begun to labour in the vineyard of

my Lord, as a minister of the EVERLASTING GOSPEL, the subject of this Lecture has frequently been alluded by my opponents; as an unequivocal demonstration of human woe in a future mode of existence; and an insurmountable obstacle to the progress of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. A variety of circumstances has called the attention of the public to this passage of scripture, as a dernier resort of the opposers of Universalism; and it has been selected seven times by different clergymen, in the vicinity of this populous and growing village, in their attempts to overthrow or establish the ABRAHAMIC FAITH. I have therefore undertaken to show, that this portion of sacred scripture relates to the severe chastisements of God, inflicted on the Jews for rejecting our Lord and persecuting his followers; and that it has no allusion whatever to the destiny of men in another and unseen world. The discussion of this contested and alarming passage shall be conducted according to the following arrangement.

1. I shall endeavour to render the translation more correct and agreeable to the original Greek.

2. I speak of the time, manner, signs, and end of Christ's coming.

1. The Greek preposition *meta* signifies *in company; co-operation in the same design; adherence to the same party*. The original meaning of the word appears to have been *a conductor whom others accompany*. Hence the phrase, *thlibomenois meth hemon*, may be rendered, *our fellow-sufferers; and meth aggelon*, co-operating with, or conducting his messengers as a leader or captain. Accordingly the seventh verse will read, “to you our fellow-sufferers at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, co-operating with his mighty messengers,” i. e. conducting the Roman army to inflict the long predicted woes on the Jewish people and nation. The phrase *diken*, in the ninth verse, answers to the *penas dare* of Virgil, and signifies to pay, justice, atone, expiate, or suffer. This is the constant and I may add the almost invariable meaning of the above phrases in the best Latin and Greek classics. The ninth verse ought therefore to read, “who shall suffer, *olethron aionion*, aionion loss from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his majesty.” Is. ii. 19, 21. The term, *olethron*, translated *destruction* has induced many to adopt the unmerciful and unscriptural notion of the annihilation of the wicked. But this fanciful opinion must have originated from inattention to the scriptural and classical use of the term as well as to the doctrine of the everlasting gospel. *Ollumi*, in Greek, *pereo* in Latin, *perdre* in French, and *perish* in English, are terms frequently used to express apprehension of some impending danger. *Olethron*, derived from *ollumi*, may therefore be correctly translated *loss*. Moreover, what Paul calls *tribulation* in the sixth verse, is denominated *destruction*, in the ninth. Where Luke uses the word *apolesai*, to destroy, Matthew employs the term *basanisaï*, to torment. Though both the evangelists intended to communicate the same idea. Luke iv. 34. Matt. viii. 23. When Matthew speaks of *destroying both soul*

and body in Gehennah, Matt. x. 28, Luke xii. 5. If the wicked be annihilated on account of their iniquity, how can the reward be according to works? But the uniform language of scripture declares both the righteous and the wicked shall be recompensed for their deeds; and men shall be beaten with many or few stripes, in proportion as they have been more or less vicious in their moral conduct. If the phrase *to be no more*, Ps. civ. 5, Lam. v. 7, which in several languages implies to die, mean utter and perpetual extinction of being, then Enoch, Joseph, and Daniel must have been annihilated. Gen. v. 24; xlii. 13, and Ps. xxxix. 13. If the *second death*, which Whitby on my text shows from the targums of Onkelos, Uzziel, and Jerusalem to be a proverbial expression, denoting the correction of the impious, mean annihilation, then those who are cast into the lake of fire cannot be tormented day and night; nor can the wrath of God abide on unbelievers. Rev. xiv. 11, John iii. 36. But Israel who destroyed himself, Hos. xiii. 9; the son of perdition, 2 Thess. ii. 3, the wicked whom the Lord will destroy, 1 Thess. i. 3, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, 2 Thess. i. 9, and will utterly perish, Deut. iv. 26, Josh. xxiii. 16, and Deut. xxx. 18, was no other, in the opinion of Lightfoot, Le Clerk, Hammond, and other able commentators, than the Jewish nation, which as a body politic and ecclesiastical was destroyed or dispersed for ever. Notwithstanding, if ever the design of God in creating intelligent beings, the objects of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, or the covenant and promises of God, be accomplished, the soul-chilling doctrines of annihilation and endless misery will then be demonstrated equally false and delusive. Let the believers of destruction reflect on the character of that God who, though he brings to destruction the sons of men, yet saith to them return again, Ps. xc. 3; and who declares that not one grain of that Israel whom he destroyed, should perish, Amos ix. 9; and then let them say whether God shall deliver from destruction agreeably to Ps. cvii. 20? If the above criticism be correct, my text will read thus, * Seeing it is righteous with God to recompense tribulation to them who trouble you, but rest to you our fellow sufferers, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, as a flame of fire, co-operating with his powerful messengers (the Roman army) administering justice to those who neither honour God nor obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall suffer aionion loss (being excluded till the fulness of the Gentiles come) from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his majesty."

As I have adopted the term aionion instead of everlasting, some explanation may be necessary. It is derived from the noun aion, which, Phavorinus says, signifies *he zoe kai ho bios*, life, or *to metron tes anthropines zoes*, the measure or length of human life. The word age is the most appropriate in the English language to express the signification of the Greek aion. Thus we speak of the age of a child, the age of a man, the antediluvian age, the Patriarchal age, the Christian age, and the age of the world. In all these examples, we find the term

age varied, and the extent of its duration known only by the qualifying words or phrases with which it is connected; for by the above example the word age may indefinitely denote a period of one year, fifty years, two thousand years, or five thousand years, as the sense may require. The Hebrew *olam* translated aion in the septuagint, and correctly rendered into English by our translators only once, Ephes. ii. 7, by the word age, signifies a concealed or unknown period of time, whose duration, like the terms aion and age, can only be measured by the subject to which it is applied. The Hebrew slave who stipulated to serve his master, *od olam*, sept. eis aiona, English for ever, Ex. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17, did not thereby agree to serve for any definite period of time; for the duration of his servitude entirely depended on the following circumstances. 1. His own death. 2. The death of his master. 3. The return of the jubilee. Which ever of these occurred first, dissolved the agreement, and effected the termination of that indefinite period indicated by the phrase *od olam, eis aiona*, for ever. Accordingly the same phrase as translated *for ever*, all the days of his life, as long as he liveth, 1 Sam. i. 11, 22, 28. Hence we see the Hebrew *od olam*, the Greek *eis aiona*, and the English for ever, or everlasting, expressive of the duration of the Hebrew's servitude, or Samuel's life might have indicated a period of one week, three days, as in Jonah ii. 6, or one year, but could not exceed the time of 48 years; for every 49th year brought again the return of jubilee. How despicable then must those doughty champions of orthodoxy and advocates of endless misery, appear to intelligent readers or hearers, when they urge the argument for eternal misery from the term aion, as implying eternal duration; while the very highest classical authority limits the term to the length of human life. Isocrates and Zenophon say *ton aiona diagein*, to pass the time of life. *Teleutesai ton aiona*, in Herodotus and Sophocles, signifies, to end life, or die. Homer uses aion frequently as the synonyme of *zoe*, life, Il. iv. 478, Il. v. 685. and Il. xvi. 458. And sometimes for the period of a short life lost in battle. *Ho nun aion*, in the scriptures always signifies the present life. See Whitby on Ephes. ii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Mark x. 30. Surely if the word aion imply eternal duration, Christ and his apostles must have been very ignorant of its meaning; for he tells them, the harvest, or founding of the christian church, is the end of the aion. Matt. xiii. 39. Lo I am with you till the end of the aion. Matt. xxviii. 20. And they ask him what shall be the signs of the end of the world, *aion*. Matt. xxiv. 3. Moreover the writers of the New Testament speak of a time before the aions began. 1 Cor. ii. 7. The beginning of the aions, Ephes. iii. 9; Col. i. 26; of the end of the aions, Heb. ix. 26; of aions past and aions to come, Col. i. 26; Ephes. ii. 7; of a period which shall last through the aions of aions, Ephes. iii. 21; of a time after the aions shall be ended, and of a period hyperbolically exceeding aionian, 2 Cor. iv. 17; and lastly of the formation, or constitution of the aions, Heb. i. 2. Do our doctors know these things? If not, are they not shame-

fully ignorant? If they do, ought not their efforts to impose on the credulous, induce us to beware of them in time to come? *Felix quem aliena periculo cautum.* (To be continued.)

APOLOGY FOR TITLES.

Mr. Woodworth in the last Number of his Missionary, under the head "*Clerical Titles*," has apologized for clerical pre-eminence. We understand that Mr. Woodworth is a "*licensed clergyman*;" consequently, will be entitled to the appellation of "*The Reverend Mr. Woodworth*." This will sound pretty, &c. and command respect, etc. Such is the pungency of Mr. W.'s taste for titles, that he "cannot help smiling at that fastidious squeamishness which characterizes modern professors of Christianity." So he says.

Mr. W. declares, "We have yet to learn, that the term *reverend* is any more the 'exclusive property of JEHOVAH,' than that of *holy, excellent, jealous, and dreadful*," &c.

If you please, Mr. Woodworth is as much entitled to the appellation of *reverend*, as he is to that of "*holy, excellent, jealous, and dreadful*." So be it.

Holy Mr. Woodworth. But is Mr. W. *holy*? O, no. Why call him so? Because he likes it.

Excellent Mr. Woodworth. Is Mr. W. *excellent*? Why, we do not know that he is. As Mr. W. is not "fastidious, nor squeamish," we presume that, in a moment of extraordinary complacency, he would meekly arrogate as much as this.

Jealous Mr. Woodworth. Is Mr. W. *jealous*? Extremely jealous of the honour and glory of one Mr. Swedenborg. His jealousy is of a quite different nature from the jealousy of the Creator.

Dreadful Mr. Woodworth! Is Mr. W. *dreadful*? We don't know. We do not dread him.

NOTE.

We tender our thanks to our Br. Thomas Gross, editor of the Gospel Advocate, for publishing in his paper our remarks and observations relative to the assumption of the word *Reverend*, by men, as a *title*, to distinguish them from others. If preachers of the salvation of all men, persist in assuming JEHOVAH's *title*, we hope they will no longer pretend to *humility*. Either be humble, or drop your pretensions. We honestly avow, that we are disgusted and pained, as often as we look at the publications of those who profess to be the meek and lowly disciples of Jesus, to see their names introduced as the "*Reverend*" conductors of the work. Who made you *Reverend*? You must answer: *We style ourselves Reverend*. This savours too much of a desire for honour and distinction among men. In plain English, it is this—Pray, Sir, what is your name? Ans. *Reverend*, &c. &c. as the case may be. Who gave you this name? No one. I assumed it. For what purpose? Because I love to be honoured of men, to be called *Rabbi*. It is more than this. *Rabbi* is simply *master*; while the word *Reverend*, is expressive of JEHOVAH's purity and excellence.

Selected.

A HYMN—Composed by Elhanan Winchester, and sung by him in his last moments.

Farewell, dear friends in Christ below,
I bid you all a short adieu;
My time is come, I long to go,
I trust, I soon my Lord shall view.

I thank you for your kindness shown,
My Jesus will reward you all;
Leave you with the Lord alone,
Till he from earth your souls shall call.

Farewell, dear neighbours, brethren, friends,
I hope we soon shall meet with joy;
My heavenly Father for me sends,
I go where nothing can annoy.

Adieu, to you my enemies,
You that have sought to do me harm,
By slander, envy, rage and lies;
But God upheld me with his arm.

I wish you all eternal life,
I owe you not the least ill-will;
My soul is free from wrath and strife,
Though me you hate, I love you still.

Adieu, thou sun, ye stars and moon,
No longer shall I need thy light;
My God's my sun, he makes my noon,
My day shall never change to night.

Adieu to all things here below,
Vain world, I leave thy fleeting toys;
Adieu, to sin, fear, pain and wo,
And welcome bright eternal joys.

Temptations, troubles, griefs adieu,
Sorrows bedew my face no more;
I go to pleasures ever new,
Where toils, and strifes, and wars are o'er.

Now I have done with earthly things,
And all to come is boundless bliss;
My eager spirit spreads her wings,
Jesus says come. I answer, yes.

Weep not, dear friends, I tell you all,
I go to dwell with Christ on high,
I hear my blessed Saviour's call,
And trusting in his promise die.

Father, I come to thee above,
All things below, I leave behind;
The fountain of eternal love,
Is opened to my joyful mind.

Eternity! transporting sound!
While God exists my heaven remains,
Fullness of joy, that knows no bounds,
Shall make my soul forget her pains.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"What think ye of Christ?"—Matt. xxii. 42.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

BALEOUR'S INQUIRY.

We have last week received a number of copies of "An Inquiry into the Scripture import of the words SHEOL, HADES, TARTARUS, and GEHENNA; all translated HELL, in the common English Version. By Walter Baleour, Charlestown," (Mass.) There are a few copies extra, after Subscribers are supplied, which can be purchased at this office. Also, For Sale—"Baleour's Eleven Sermons."

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1824.

NO. 46.

From the (Buffalo) Gospel Advocate.

CHRIST'S COMING TO JUDGMENT.

A Lecture on 2 Thess. i. 6-10. delivered at Rochester, (N. Y.) Nov. 24th, 1823, by Brother J. S. THOMPSON.

(Continued from p. 360.)

Having ascertained the import of the word *aion*, nothing more is needful than only to mention that *aionios* is derived from *aion* exactly as the word yearly from year, or daily from day; and as *aion* can never imply infinite duration, the *aionion* loss or destruction must be temporary. This view of the subject entirely excludes the doctrine of annihilation as well as that of endless misery; and at once pronounces the reign of evil or loss to be limited, and followed by a blissful succession of ages, producing streams of pure perennial felicity, lasting and perpetual as the existence of Deity, and universal as the whole number of intellectual beings throughout his vast empire. Here, I conclude this part of my discourse by observing, that the *aionion* loss mentioned in my text, is the *aionion* correction, (as the word implies, Matt. xxv. 46, 1 John iv. 18. see *Petitpierre*, on the Divine Goodness,) whose duration and termination is distinctly fixed by the apostle to the time of the fulness of the Gentiles, Rom. xi. 25. Then will the *aions* terminate, Eph. i. 10. And all Israel will be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation!

2. I shall now proceed to consider the time, manner, signs, and end of Christ's coming.

1. The Time. The coming of Christ called by Paul *Parousias tou Kuriou*, 2 Thess. ii. 1, is by the learned Dr. Hammond, referred to his coming to destroy the Jewish nation and worship. To this period, says Dr. Whitby, the apostle James most certainly alludes where he exhorts the brethren to be patient till the coming of the Lord: adding this *parousai*, or coming of the Lord, is at hand, and the judge standeth before the door. James v. 7-9. This is the coming of the Son, so often mentioned in the prophecies, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jewish nation. Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39. This appearance of the Son of Man, was immediately to follow the tribulation of the Jews, occasioned by the invasion of the Roman army. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall appear the sign of the Son in Heaven—and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." Matt. xxiv. 29, 30. For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people—and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem

shall be trodden down of the Gentiles; then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. Luke xxi. 23, 27. The time of Christ's coming was so distinctly fixed, that none could possibly mistake. There be some of you standing here, said our Lord to his disciples, who shall not taste death till ye see the Son of Man come in his kingdom. Matt. xvi. 28. Mark ix. 1. Luke ix. 27. When they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come. Matt. x. 23. This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Matt. xxiv. 34. Mark xiii. 30. Luke xxi. 32. This prediction was verified in John, and explains our Lord's meaning, John xxi. 22. If he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Indeed the language of Christ could not be more definite and determinate than it was in reply to the high Priest's adjuration. Matt. xxvi. 64. HAPARTY, presently, after a short time, ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. Accordingly both Christ and his apostles warned their auditors to watch, and be prepared for that event, seeing it might be both sudden and unexpected. Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. Matt. xxiv. 44. Paul exhorts the Philippians to moderation, and adds as a reason, the Lord is at hand, Phil. iv. 5. He adviseth the Thessalonians not to sleep as others, but to watch and be sober; and appeals to their knowledge of the uncertainty of Christ's coming, as an argument for vigilance. Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night. But ye are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief. 1 Thess. v. 2. iv. 6. In like manner Peter admonishes all to whom his epistle might come, to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things was at hand, and Christ was ready to judge both the quick and the dead. 1 Peter iv. 5, 7. Behold I come quickly, says Jesus, he that is unjust, let him be unjust still. Seal not the prophecies of this book for the time is at hand. Rev. xxii. 10, 12. What shall we say of those preachers, who 1750 years after these predictions have been fulfilled, still persuade their hearers to expect Christ's coming to judgment? Let us pity them!! For either the Scriptures are a forgery, or these teachers of the law, know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm!!

Some may object to the time I have fixed for the coming of Christ, from the language of the apostle in the next chapter, where he cautions the Thessalonians not to be troubled by his word or letter concerning the coming of Christ, which might have

excited alarm; for previously to that event there would come *apostasia* a falling away; and the map of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. This grand apostacy has generally been applied by protestant commentators, to the corruptions of the Romish church, and consequently those who have been educated under the influence of tradition may be inclined to object to any sentiment inconsistent with the prejudices of their education. But how is it possible on the common theory to account for the general alarm occasioned by the first epistle? It is evident from 2 Thess. ii. 1, that the Thessalonians understood the apostle as speaking of an event altogether at hand, in the first epistle, chap. ii. 19, chap. iii. 13, chap. iv. 15, and chap. v. 23. The apostle begins the second chapter of his second epistle thus, "I beseech you brethren, that ye be not troubled concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our translators have unwarrantably and ignorantly rendered *hyper tes parousias*, by the coming, without one single classical authority. On the contrary, I have rendered it *concerning or on account of*, which is the true and proper meaning of the term *hyper*. The Latin *super* is evidently derived from the Greek *hyper*, and retains its signification in the following phrase, *super Hectore multa*, asking many things concerning Hector. One principal cause of the second epistle was undoubtedly to remove the apprehensions excited by the first. Notwithstanding the apostle says *nothing in the second* to induce them to believe that any considerable time should elapse before the coming of Christ. On the contrary, he tells them, chap. ii. 6, 7. *The mystery of iniquity doth already work*; and appeals to their own knowledge of the cause of delay in Christ's coming; and informs them that as soon as he who now liveth (in all probability Claudius the Emperor) shall be taken away by death, then shall the wicked be revealed, then shall the Jews make defection from the Roman government which shall occasion their destruction by the Roman army. This is the grand civil apostacy which produced their overthrow and dispersion. That this apostacy was a civil rebellion, Mr. Le Clerc on Hammond, has abundantly shown; the term apostacy is frequently used in scripture in a political sense. Jerusalem is called three times in one chapter *Polis-apostasia*, the apostate city. Ez. iv. 12, 15, 19. Whitby agrees with Le Clerc, but believes the apostacy also implied a religious defection. There can be no doubt but that the great apostacy of the Jews from christianity before Christ's coming hastened their destruction. This much appears from the words of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 22. "*Except those days should be shortened no flesh should be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.*" Their religious apostacy arose from their attachment to the law of Moses; secondly, from their expectations of a temporal Messiah; and, thirdly, from their severe sufferings by persecution. To this apostacy the apostles refer in awful language, Matt. xviii. 7, 8, 9. Heb. vi. 6, 8. It became exceedingly great, not only in Judea and Palestine, but also in Asia, and all places where the Jews had received

the gospel, 2 Tim. i. 15. This falling away was distinctly foretold by our Lord, Matt. xxiv. 11, 12, as an event which should precede the destruction of Jerusalem. No inference therefore can be drawn from this epistle to dissolve the connexion between this apostacy and Christ's coming. Therefore the coming of Christ mentioned by Paul must be the appearance of the Son of man to destroy the Jewish polity and nation.

There being many who think that the prohibition to marry, was peculiar to the Catholic defection, a few remarks relative to that subject, may therefore be necessary in this place. Dr. Whitby in his commentary, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 1, has sufficiently demonstrated, that it was a philosophical question much agitated in the days of Paul, whether it were good to marry? Bion, Antisthenes, Menander, Appollonius, Porphyry, and the Pythagoreans, in general, held the negative.

As the Pythagorean philosophy was very popular at Corinth and other parts of Greece, the apostle might, therefore, notice it with disapprobation. But from what he says, 1 Cor. vii. 8, 27, 29, 40, it is manifest, that Paul could not have considered the prohibition to marry as any considerable part of the apostacy. The Judaizers were beyond all others the most remarkably peculiar in their restrictions concerning meats. Dr. Lightfoot on Acts xv. 20, shows that when the second temple was destroyed, the Pharisees who taught that it was unlawful to eat flesh or drink wine, said, "*we should ordain among ourselves not to marry.*" The Essenes were disinclined to marry, and the Gnostics, who probably sprang from Menander, held that to eat flesh or marry was of the Devil. Hence we see there is no sufficient reason for the peculiar application of this prohibition to the Roman Catholic Church.

Objection second. The coming of Christ, is said to take place in the last days, and that event is generally called the last day. The Jewish Rabbies admit as a *general rule*, that wherever we meet the phrase, *the last days*, or *the latter days*, we should understand it, of the *days or age of the Messiah*. The Targums thus interpret the phrase, Gen. xlix. 1, Numb. xxiv. 14, Isa. ii. 2, Jer. xxiii. 20, Dan. ii. 44, Hos. iii. 5. Peter applies the last days of Joel's prophecy to the time of Christ. Acts ii. 17, 2 Peter iii. 3. The other apostles use the same phraseology, to denote the same epoch. 2 Tim. iii. 1, 2. 1 John ii. 18, Jude xvii. 18. Dr. Pocock justly observes, that by the latter days, most Jewish and Christian commentators understood the days of the Messiah, who is called in the Sept. Vers. Isa. ix. 6, *Pater æonis mellontis*, Father of the age to come: See Whitby on Heb. vi. 5, et alibi. Moreover, the Hebrews always use the plural number, to express honour, dignity, and emphasis: therefore according to the idiom of the sacred writers, *last days*, when used to denote the time of the Messiah, mean only the *last day* in the singular. Hence John calls the same period of time *last day*, *last hour*, John xi. 24, 1 John ii. 18. Consequently *last day*, in scriptural language, means *the whole or*

any part of the Christian era. This objection therefore arises from ignorance of the language of scripture, and cannot militate against the time I have fixed for the coming of Christ. Consult Simpson's Essays on the language of scripture.

Objection third. In Matt. xxiv. 30. and Rev. i. 17, it is said, all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, when they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. To this we reply: in Jewish and prophetic language, *the earth* is often limited to *the land of Judea*. Isa. xi. 4. Mat. iv. 6, Ps. xvi. 3, xxv. 13, xxii. 29. 34, xxxvii. 3, 9, 11. See Whitby's appendix to Matt. xxiv. and Dr. Campbell's Notes on Matt. ii. 6, and Luke ii. 1. Supposing John to have wrote the Revelation so late as 96, which is by no means probable, he might notwithstanding use the words of Christ, seeing the great destruction of the Jews by Adrian, was still future. But the evidence is in favour of that hypothesis which fixes the date of the Apocalypse to the reign of Claudius or Nero. The style of this book is much fuller of Hebraisms, than that of the Gospel, consequently written soon after John left Judea, where he had been accustomed to speak Syriac. He calls the governors of the churches angels, but Paul in his first epistle to Timothy, about the year 63, calls them bishops, which title was ever after retained in the churches, consequently the revelation was written before the epistle to Timothy. Epiphanius affirms that John prophesied in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, and his opinion appears to be confirmed by allusions in the Revelation, to the temple and altar as then standing. The title of the Syriac version of this book, which at least shows the opinion of the churches of Syria, is, "The Revelation made to John the Evangelist, by God, in the Isle of Patmos, where he was banished by Nero the Cæsar." Hence we have sufficient reason to conclude, that John wrote the Revelation before the destruction of Jerusalem; and that the references to the day of judgment, coming of Christ, and passing away of the heavens, were allusions to the abolition of the Jewish dispensation.

2. The manner of Christ's coming. The text declares, he shall be revealed, *a flame in fire*—i. e. in great splendour, like a flame of fire.

The word Phlogos, is in apposition with Kuriou, and words put in apposition mean the same person or thing. Hence the Lord Jesus is here called a flame by fire. But as the word is derived from Phlego, which signifies to shine, as well as to burn, the phrase may mean no more than that as the brightness of fire, or in fiery brightness, the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven. As Paul was a Jew, he adopted the language of their prophets Joel and Malachi, who had called the time of Christ's coming to destroy the Jewish nation, *the great and bright day of the Lord*. Joel ii. 31, Mal. iv. 5. Isaiah predicted that the breath of his lips should slay the wicked, and Paul citing his words, declares, the Lord shall consume the wicked with the breath of his mouth. Isa. xi. 4, 2 Thess ii. 8. Malachi says, Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all that do wickedly shall be

stubble, and the day shall burn them. Mal. iv. 1. Alluding to the same event, the Psalmist says—A devouring fire shall go before Jehovah. Psa. i. 3. John the Baptist foretold, that Christ would burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable. Matt. iii. 12. And Paul warns the Corinthians, that the day should be revealed by fire, which should try every man's work. 1 Cor. iii. 12. These passages of scripture seem to mark the severity of that condemnation which befel the ancient people of God, on account of their unbelief and apostasy.

Notwithstanding, the appearance of Christ as a fiery brightness was not designed to indicate a wrathful or avenging disposition, but merely the dignity and glory of his person and office. This will readily be admitted by all who attentively consider the language of the Jewish scriptures. When Jehovah appeared on Sinai, the mountain burned with fire. Ex. xix. 18, Deut. iv. 11, and ix. 15. There he showed Israel his great fire—i. e. the glory of his majesty. Deut. ix. 36. The Shechinah, or glory of the Lord which abode between the cherubims in the temple, was the appearance of a flame of fire. The person who appeared to Ezekiel in vision, *was surrounded with brightness which was the glory of the Lord; and the brightness was as the appearance of fire*. Chap. i. 27, 28. The appearance also of the creatures which drew the triumphal car of Jehovah, was as a flash of lightning, and as burning coals of fire, like the appearance of lamps; and out of the fire went forth lightning; and the whole appearance of Jehovah's train was as fire enfolding itself, and a brightness round about it. Ex. i. 4, 13, 14. At the translation of Elijah, there appeared horses and chariots of fire. 2 Kings ii. 11. Elisha was surrounded with horses and chariots of fire, as an emblem of the divine presence and protection. 2 Kings vi. 17. The throne of the Ancient of Days was like a fiery flame, and the wheels like a flame of fire. Dan. vii. 9. The seven spirits before the throne appeared like lamps burning with fire. Rev. iv. 5. Malachi prophesied that Christ should be as a refiner's fire; and our Lord foretold, that as lightning shineth from the east towards the west, so should the coming of the Son of Man be. Mal. iii. 2, Matt. xxiv. 27, Luke xvii. 24.

We may therefore safely conclude the apostle had these predictions full in view, when he wrote my text; and described the coming of Christ, as the appearance of fire. Indeed our Lord foretold he would come in the glory of his Father; but the glory of the Father was always manifested to the Jews by a brightness or appearance of fire. Hence the fiery brightness denotes the majesty of Christ, and not his judgments; much less can it denote a material fire designed to devour his enemies! Though the severe judgments of the Deity be sometimes represented in the Scriptures, under the notion of fire, streams of fire, or a furnace of fire; yet this is not the design of the metaphor in my text; for the glory of Christ, and not his judgments, are indicated by the flame.

Numerous passages of sacred writ show the fiery brightness attending the manifestation of Je-

hovah, or his messengers, to be an emblem of majesty, and not of vengeance.

(To be continued.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

LIFE OF DR. CHAUNCY.

(Continued from p. 357.)

It was now a long time that he had exerted his mental powers to their utmost tension. Four years of the most intense study, and as many more of controversy and opposition; the harassing cares attendant on one who stands the champion against popular sentiment, together with the labours of the ministry, which he did not neglect, had at length impaired his health and broken his constitution. But, in the mean while, he had the pleasure of seeing the fury of fanaticism subside, and the more intelligent part of the community returning to the enjoyment of its reason. Those who at first shrunk back, through fear, began to come forward, with a good degree of boldness and zeal. It happened as usual in such cases; when the battle was fought, and the enemy retiring, the timid and irresolute ventured on the pursuit, and seemed disposed to atone for their former cowardice, by the abundance of their newly acquired courage.

Chauncy now perceived that it was necessary to make his health the object of his care. He accordingly adopted a severe regimen, and performed several journeys of from seven hundred to a thousand miles each. This mode of life he was obliged to pursue for three or four years, in order to regain his health. Still, however, he preached at times; and on one occasion gave a striking proof that the weakness of his body had not enfeebled his resolution. Preaching according to appointment, at the opening of the General Court of Massachusetts, in 1747, he so manifestly inveighed against some of its former measures, and addressed the members in a style so plainly expostulatory, as to give much offence; and it was debated in court, whether a copy of the sermon should, according to invariable custom, be requested for the press. When Chauncy was told of this, he replied to his informant, "It shall be printed whether the General Court print it or not. And do you, Sir, say from me, that if I wanted to initiate and instruct a person into all kinds of iniquity and double-dealing, I would send him to our General Court." A copy was requested, however, in due form, and the discourse printed. It is a performance of some ability; and is remarkable for its free exposition of public concerns, and its unceremonious, but energetic address to the representative orders of the government.

Having recovered his health to a good degree, he soon undertook a close and critical study of the Scriptures, particularly of the Epistles of St. Paul. This investigation was commenced about the year 1750. In order to avail himself of what assistance the labours of others would afford, he searched the libraries in Boston and Cambridge for every thing that had a tendency to illustrate the sacred writings; and sent to England for a considerable number of works, recommended by Dr. Doddridge,

which could not be found in this country. In this study, he spent *seven years* of the best part of his life. He was rewarded with a discovery of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. At least, it is sufficiently evident, from many circumstances, that it was in this course of investigation he first perceived that doctrine to be taught in the Scriptures. The progress of his mind in this discovery, is related in so natural a manner by himself, that I shall favour my readers with his own language: "I had no idea of this sentiment, till I had been gradually and insensibly let into it by a long and diligent comparing of scripture with scripture. For a while, I could not, without considerable difficulty, consult the sacred writings upon this point, unrestrained from previously imbibed sentiments. It was with care and pains that I brought myself so far to suspect the truth of common doctrines, as to be able, with tolerable freedom of mind, to inquire whether this had a just foundation in the word of God, or not. But when I had once disengaged myself from the influence of former notions, so as to be able to look into the Scriptures with a readiness to receive whatever they should teach for truth, it was truly surprising to me to find in them such evident traces of this doctrine."*

During this long course of study, he collected materials for the following works: 1. his *Dissertation on the Fall and its Consequences*: 2. his treatise *on the Benevolence of the Deity*: 3. *A Key to the New Testament*, designed to prepare the mind for reading and understanding that part of the inspired volume. This last work was never published, and probably never finished; nor did the two former make their appearance, till within two or three years of the author's death. But what is more worthy of notice, it was at this period that he collected the materials for his famous work on *the Salvation of All Men*; which, it seems, he soon afterwards composed into its present form, and then laid by for his own revision, and that of some theologians and critics, to whom he entrusted the secret. It is mortifying to relate, that the man who had shown himself so intrepid, so nobly independent, now yielded to the time-serving policy of concealing an important and beneficial doctrine from the public; and that he sometimes hesitated whether to permit his work, which he really esteemed the most valuable of his productions, ever to be published, or to commit it to the flames. There are undoubtedly many circumstances to extenuate his weakness; but it is to be hoped, for the interest of truth, that nothing will ever be urged to justify it.

Reserving some more particular observations on this work for another place, I shall proceed to mention a few of his miscellaneous sermons, before giving an account of his publications and controversy on the subject of Episcopacy.

On the 18th of November, 1755, a violent earthquake, generally called *the great earthquake*, shook

* See page vi. of the Preface to his work, on *The Salvation of All Men*; and the 16th page of the work itself. A few words are changed in the above quotation, for the purpose of bringing the extracts to read properly in this connexion, but without changing the author's meaning.

the whole country from Pennsylvania to the northern parts of Canada. The next Sunday Chauncy preached a sermon intended to enforce the superstitious notion, that earthquakes, in general, are the special manifestations of God's anger for the sins of the people.† This sort of philosophy is but the remains of that which could formerly discover in the thunder-storm, in the aurora borealis, in the approach of comets, and in all the phenomena of nature, the rising fury of the Almighty Sovereign.

It was on the 1st of the same month, that a large part of the city of Lisbon was overthrown by a tremendous earthquake, which extended through all Europe and to the northern regions of Africa. After the accounts of this great convulsion had reached America, Chauncy published (1756) a sermon in reference to the event: in which he held forth the opinion, then not uncommon, that the seasons and climate, the soil, and bowels of the earth, have all been changed in consequence of Adam's fall, so that the whole constitution of Nature is far different from what it was before. But he supposed that after it has served mankind for a scene of trial, it will be restored to its primitive state of order and beauty, and become the *new heavens and new earth* mentioned by St. Peter and St. John, "where good men, after the resurrection and judgment, shall reign with Christ for ever and ever." The fanciful conjectures of this sort, which learned men have indulged, may amuse by their unlucky contrariety; some having maintained, with equal confidence, that this earth will be eventually fitted up for the hell of the damned. Chauncy, however, contrived to hold both these notions.

In 1762, he published a sermon delivered at the ordination of a missionary to the Mowhawk Indians. It is entitled *All nations blessed in Christ*; and contains some cautious hints in favour of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. This is worthy of particular notice, as it is probably the only instance, if we except a passage or two in his *Benevolence of the Deity*, in which he ever exhibited, to the public, any indications of that doctrine, *without concealing his name*. Even in this instance, his courage does not seem to have been equal to that of his friend, the celebrated Dr. Mayhew, who delivered two discourses, towards the close of the same year, in which he gave such striking intimations of Universalism, as must have been understood even by his hearers, and the readers of that day.

The Sandemanians having lately opened a meeting and gathered a church in Boston, Chauncy published *Twelve Sermons*, 1765, referring particularly to their doctrines. In these he endeavoured to shew that it is impossible for us to yield that obedience to the law either of Moses or of natural religion, which would be necessary to justification, if sought by this means; and that consequently, none can be *saved*, but on the more indulgent terms offered in the gospel: the terms of *faith*, instead of that *perfect obedience* which is *naturally* requisite. He then

proceeds to show that this faith is of a kind superior to simple belief; that its effect is to purify the heart; that, for its objects, it embraces the truths, in general, contained in the revelations of God; and that it is the act of man's free agency. He contends that it is to be attained to, by the use of means; and that the earnest endeavours of the unregenerate to acquire it, are, to a degree, blessed and accepted of God. In these sermons it is manifest, that, while he discarded the doctrine of total depravity, the author believed our moral condition to be, in some way, affected by Adam's transgression; though, if we judge by a piece† which he had published some time before, he did not suppose us guilty or punishable on our first parent's account.

We are now arrived at that period of his life, in which he stood distinguished as the principal advocate for the Congregational churches, against the doctrine and measures of the Episcopalians. The church of England had been, for more than half a century, gradually introducing her missionaries into this country, not much to the satisfaction of the descendants of those who fled hither from her oppressions. At length, having succeeded in settling a number of her clergymen in the colonies, she began to project the establishment of bishops in America. This excited a universal alarm among the Congregationalists, who feared, and perhaps with some reason, that the design, if effected, would grow into an ecclesiastical domination. They knew that the English church, by her combination with the British government, shared a vast and overwhelming power; and who could assure them that she would always maintain such a superiority over parental partiality, as to withhold from her daughter in America, that pre-eminence, which she herself enjoyed at home?

In this season of anxiety, they saw in the revered and lamented Mayhew, an advocate who showed himself both able and zealous to maintain their cause; but in 1766, he sunk into an untimely grave, and left the burthen of the contest to his friend Chauncy, who lacked his genius and taste, but surpassed him in learning. Chauncy had not been an unconcerned, nor an idle spectator of the late measures of the Episcopalians: in 1762, he had published his *Dudleian Lecture, on the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination*; in which he maintained, with learning and ability, that *bishops and presbyters* were considered as one and the same order of ministers, till the end of the second century. To this discourse was affixed a large *Appendix*, giving a brief historical account of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, and exhibiting some of the many reasons why they ought not to be depended on as his uncorrupted works." The occasion of this Appendix was, that much use had been made of these Epistles to show that the government of the Christian church in the Apostolic age, was Episcopal. In 1767, he published *Remarks on the Bishop of Landaff's sermon*, delivered before the society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts.

† This notion seems scarcely reconcilable with what Chauncy advances on the subject, in his treatise "On the Benevolence of the Deity." See page 257, and onward.

‡ "The opinion of one who has perused the *Summer Morning's Conversation*," &c. 1753.

The Bishop had represented the American Colonies as almost destitute of the Christian ministry, and as degenerating towards heathenism. In this representation he was joined by Bishop Warburton; and these two prelates, it seems, repeated only the language that was common among the English Episcopalians, at that day. Chauncy affects to impute these misrepresentations to ignorance; but it is to be feared they resulted rather from prejudice against the Colonies, and against the Congregational churches in particular.

But what rendered Chauncy the most distinguished at this period, was his controversy with Dr. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, N. J.; who, by the appointment of the Episcopalian clergy in this country, published (1767) *An Appeal to the Public, in behalf of the Church of England in America*. In this, Chandler contended, that since the Episcopalians conscientiously believed that none but a bishop has authority to ordain ministers, and perform other rites necessary in their church, they ought, according to every principle of religious liberty, to be allowed bishops in America. To remove all suspicions of any design to domineer, he stated that it had been agreed between the Episcopalians in this country, and their superiors at home, that the bishops to be sent here should be divested of all the civil authority they possessed in England, and suffered to retain no power but that of ecclesiastical government over their own ministers and churches. In short, they were to be such bishops as have been actually settled in the United States since the revolution. Chauncy answered the appeal in 1768. He asserted that it was *not* the genuine doctrine of the church of England, that none but bishops possessed the power of ordination and of ecclesiastical government; and adduced a great many testimonies from the writings of Episcopalians, especially those of the earlier ages of the reformation, in support of his position. He observed, also, that the management of the Episcopalians in this country had been such as to countenance suspicions that their bishops, if obtained, would not prove to be so restricted in their powers as the Appeal represented; and that these suspicions were increased by the late measures of the British government. Next year (1769) Chandler answered him, in *The Appeal Defended*; to which Chauncy replied in 1770. Chandler rejoined, in 1771, in *The Appeal farther Defended*; to which Chauncy made no reply.

This controversy extended to nearly a thousand octavo pages, and embraced, among a variety of other subjects, the arguments commonly urged in support of the doctrine of Episcopacy. Like most controversies, it contains, on both sides, too much personal reflection without wit, and complaint without necessity. Chandler had the littleness to jeer at the inaccuracy of his opponent's style; to which perhaps, he was provoked by ostentation on Chauncy's part. Both writers evinced an extensive and minute acquaintance with the history of the English Church; but it is impossible for one not versed in the subject, to decide on the merits of the controvert-

ists. Chauncy received the formal thanks of the congregational clergy; and perhaps the Episcopalians were well enough satisfied with their champion. The project for an American Episcopate was not put into execution, however, till after the revolutionary war. (To be continued.)

From the (Portland) Christian Intelligencer.

THE SIN UNTO DEATH.

Mr. Streeter—A few days since, as I took up one of your Intelligencers, I thought it would be very agreeable to see your explanation of 1 John v. 16; and I concluded to write you on the subject. But afterwards, turning to the passage in Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, in order to furnish myself with learned arguments, I was constrained to give up all objections to your doctrine, as arising from that text. My conscience, therefore compels me to acknowledge the light which I received on that difficult and dreadful subject. I feel to praise the Lord that I can now see an ocean of mercy, for many, who are thought to be beyond its reach; and the more mercy I discover, the more beautiful and glorious does my blessed Saviour appear.

On the words, "*There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it,*" the Doctor thus writes:

"*The sin unto death* means a case of transgression, particularly of grievous backslidings from the life and power of godliness, which God determines to punish with temporal death; while at the same time he extended MERCY to the penitent soul. The disobedient prophet, 1 Kings xiii. 1, 2, is, on this interpretation, a case in point; many others occur in the history of the church, and of every religious community. *The sin not unto death* is any sin which God does not choose thus to punish. This view of the subject is that taken by the late Rev. J. Wesley, in a sermon, entitled, *A call to Backsliders*. Works, vol. x. page 92.

"I do not think the passage has any thing to do with what is termed, the *sin against the Holy Ghost*, much less with the Popish doctrine of *purgatory*. However, this we know, that any penitent may find mercy through Christ Jesus; for through him every kind of sin may be forgiven to man, except the sin against the Holy Ghost, which I have proved no man can now commit."

What do you imagine my disappointment must have been, to meet with the above and much more like it, when I was in search of learned, powerful arguments against the doctrine you defend? *The sin unto death* has ever been considered as an insuperable objection to the final salvation of all who commit it. But I am now convinced that *sins not unto death*, are those which might be pardoned, by the civil law; and the *sin unto death*, was any one that subjected the perpetrator to execution, without the privilege of forgiveness. There would be much propriety in praying for remission, where there was a prospect of being heard; but there would be no propriety in interceding for the forgiveness of sins, for the remission of which the law made no provision. But this furnishes no argument against their

final happiness, since it is not uncommon to see the most pious Christians, circulating *confessions of penitence* by men who were executed for the greatest crimes; and every real saint actually prays for the ultimate salvation of all mankind. May God prevent us all from committing the sin unto death. Blessed be his name, religion is good in this life; and I can heartily say—

"O to grace how great a debtor,
Daily I'm constrain'd to be!" METHODIST.

CALVINISTIC DOCTRINES,

SUPPLANTED BY THE ARMINIAN SENTIMENT.

It is a fact that cannot pass unnoticed by the reflecting part of the community, that Calvinists generally are abandoning their once favourite system of partial election and reprobation. This doctrine, which but a few years since, was considered the sheet anchor of orthodoxy, has lost, of late, its potent charms to that degree that it has but very few admirers or advocates. And what is the cause of this wonderful change? It was boldly asserted some fifty years ago, that God had predetermined to save a part of his offspring, and make the remainder infinitely miserable. Whoever did not preach this system of "election and reprobation" was anathematized, and even stigmatized with the name of HERETIC. Every doctrine contrary to this was pronounced heterodox. So highly elated were the believers and preachers of this sentiment, with that joy and glory that would accrue in consequence of the misery of mankind, and so amply were they instructed, as they pretended, in divine subjects, that they unequivocally declared that God had embraced in the subject of "election" little children and even infants; and irrevocably decreed the unceasing torment of a vast majority of those that might die in a state of infancy. However horrible this sentiment now appears to the philanthropist, however cruel it may represent God's conduct toward his creatures, and however repugnant it may be to the common sympathies of our nature, it had its admirers and warm advocates. In fact, he was not admitted orthodox, who denied that "hell was paved with the bones of infants." The reader may shudder at this, and even doubt what we say, but we can assure all who may read this, that we have been personally acquainted with those that cherished the idea, and publicly avowed it. But times are altered. Among all the Calvinists with whom we are acquainted, both clergy and laity, we can find none that believe infants will be punished endlessly. None of our Calvinistic clergy preach this. None inculcate it in the private circle. None incorporate it in their printed productions. But why not preach this doctrine? If it be true that God appointed, before the world began, a part to happiness, and made this appointment without any regard to works to be performed by us, without taking into the account the character of the subject of such appointment, it may also be true, that he elected some infants and reprobated others. According to the sentiment under examination, infants are no more fit for heaven than adults, and one deserves hell just

as much as another. But, however, for some cause, it has been deemed expedient by professed Calvinists to abandon this doctrine altogether, and preach salvation for all infants. Here then is one great departure from the original mode of preaching, and entire abandonment of this part of the system.

There is another important change which we will notice, to prove that Calvinists have become converts to Arminianism. The doctrine of "election and reprobation," as it was formerly taught, is no longer preached among us, by any respectable preacher. The preachers of the present day generally tell their hearers that God has provided salvation for all men; that Christ has ransomed all that may come and be saved, if they are so disposed; that if they will accept of the proffered gift, every intelligent being may be happy; that God has *willed* (and of course not *decreed*) the happiness of all the souls he has made, or intends to make; and that there is nothing to prevent the final happiness of the moral world, but their rejecting the offers of God. Here then is rank Arminianism. Calvinistic preachers (professedly so) proclaim this from their pulpits, and inculcate their principles in the circles in which they move. Ask them if God has made it possible for all to be happy? and they will tell you YES. They, in conjunction with the laity, talk loudly of a free salvation. We may now visit those places which have resounded again and again with the voice of the adherents of Calvin's gloomy creed, and we cannot hear any thing in favour of those doctrines which were once considered indispensably necessary to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and happiness of the favourite few. It is now considered a great crime to tell a professed Calvinist that he is a believer in those doctrines framed by the gloomy mind of the hard-hearted Genevan. Tell a member of a confessedly Calvinistic Church, one who has before the world declared his assent to the rigid doctrines of Calvin and his disciples, that he professedly believes, that God has foreordained the happiness of a few, and the endless perdition of the many, and he will be likely to fix upon you the charge of falsehood. In truth, nothing gives more offence than to advert to their sentiments, and tell them they belong to what is called the orthodox church.

These facts furnish Arminians with an ample subject for reproving, and enabling them to triumph over, the Calvinists. Calvinists must feel mortified and chagined in the extreme, at this; when it is recollected that they once deemed no epithet too low, or censure too severe to utter against the heretical (as they call them) Arminians. The Arminians have finally gained a decided victory, and the Calvinists have at last evinced a willingness to adopt those sentiments which they once detested.

It may be asked, why is this change? We answer, it is measurably owing to the spread of liberal principles. By a majority of mankind (though we do not consider it any more reasonable) the doctrine of Arminianism, so far as it represents the offer of salvation to all, will undoubtedly be considered one degree better than Calvinism. We are pleased to

see so much dissatisfaction with the doctrine of "particular election" manifested among those who were once its admirers, and all reflecting people; we will also adventure the declaration, that within fifty years, the doctrines of Calvin and Arminius, so far as they limit the goodness and salvation of our heavenly Father, will be ranked with the absurd and dogmatical system of Mahomet. *Gos. Inq.*

DIALOGUE.

The following dialogue lately took place in the western part of the state of New-York, between a Universalist preacher and one of those pious indigent young men, a charity scholar, who was about to enter into the labours of the ministry. The Universalist called at the house of a friend, where he found two of these gentlemen beneficiaries. After being introduced to the master of the house, one, whom we will designate by the term Calvinist, in a very pompous manner, commenced the discourse.

C. (Addressing the Universalist.) Well, Sir, and what do you think of this great work of the Lord? (Alluding to a revival in the neighbourhood.)

U. What do I think of the work of the Lord; Sir, I reverence and admire the work of the Lord, displayed in the system of nature. There I behold his power and Godhead, discover the infinitude of divine wisdom, and contemplate with wonder and admiration, the goodness of God which beautifies and adorns the whole. In the works of Providence I view, with feelings of gratitude, a parent's love in providing for his offspring, and supplying, with unbounded liberality, the wants of all animated beings that are dependent on his bounty. In the system of redeeming grace I adore that work of the Lord which delivers the captive, long confined in chains of sin, liberates the soul from bondage, and brings man to the knowledge and enjoyment of his God and Saviour. I think, Sir, that the work of the Lord is not limited or confined, his power is displayed in all the revolving spheres which float throughout the vast immensity of space; His wisdom is infinite in the most extended sense of the word; and his love is universal, embracing all worlds and beings which he has made.

C. I find, Sir, that you are a Universalist, and therefore call upon you to repent, and renounce that damnable doctrine.

U. Before you call upon me to repent and renounce this doctrine, it is necessary you should prove to me, that the doctrine is false. Are you willing, Sir, to enter into a discussion of the subject, and attempt, by arguments drawn from scripture and reason, to convince me I am in an error?

C. No, Sir, I do not wish to converse with Universalists, there are no men of piety or religion among them, they never pray, they do not believe in the necessity of repentance.

U. You mistake, Sir, they do pray, most sincerely and fervently, and believe in repentance.

C. Yes, yes, I have often heard Universalists say they prayed, but never heard one: I do not believe they ever pray. Will you pray, Sir?

U. Yes, Sir, if you will call the family together,

I will pray with and for you. And more, Sir, I will pray in faith, nothing doubting. Will you invite the family to attend?

C. No, Sir, I do not want to hear a Universalist pray. I know they cannot pray, what have they got to pray for!

U. Well, Sir, if you will not suffer me to pray, will you have the goodness to pray—will you pray for me, and pray in faith, nothing doubting, that God would convince me, if in an error, and strengthen me, if in the truth. Come, Sir, will you pray?

C. No, I won't. I do not wish to have any thing to say, or do with Universalists, and will not stay any longer with you. (With this he abruptly left the house.)

U. (Following him to the door.) Well, Sir, if you will neither converse with me, nor pray for me, I have one word to say to you. You asked me what I thought of the work of the Lord. I will tell you—I think that the wisdom of the Lord, is very apparent in his work this morning, in suffering you to show your weakness, and the spirit of the doctrine by which you are influenced, which forbids your attempting to convince me if in error, or to pray for me if I stand in need of salvation. It is very evident, Sir, that God has sent you strong delusions that you may believe a lie and be damned, being disobedient to the truth, and having pleasure in unrighteousness, which is evident in your charging Universalists with what they are not guilty of, and grossly misrepresenting them. Although you cannot pray for me, yet I can pray for you, and will pray for you, that God will be pleased to open your eyes, deliver you from the delusions you are now under, and enable you to pray for your fellow men in faith, nothing doubting. *Rel. Inq.*

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

CHRISTIANITY,

Is all mildness and all beauty: it breathes nothing but pure benevolence in God, and it appeals to the best feelings of man. It is essentially a religion of love, and has no dark shades blended with its brilliant tints—no devil to blacken the moral horizon and to frustrate and baffle the designs of God. It affords every encouragement to virtue, and every discouragement to vice; and it evidently indicates the approximation of a period in which truth shall triumph over error, felicity be universal, and God be all among all. *A.*

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"The Second Death"—Rev. xx. 14.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1824.

NO. 47.

From the (Buffalo) Gospel Advocate.

CHRIST'S COMING TO JUDGMENT.

A Lecture on 2 Thess. i. 6-10. delivered at Rochester, (N. Y.) Nov. 24, 1823, by Br. J. S. THOMPSON.

(Continued from p. 364.)

3. The signs of Christ's coming. The shaking of the heavens; the heavens passing away with a great noise; the elements melting with fervent heat; the earth and its works burned up; the sun darkened; the moon not giving her light; and the stars falling from heaven; great earthquakes; fearful sights, and signs in the heavens; famines and pestilence; the sea and the waves thereof roaring. Matt. xxiv. 29, Luke xxi. 11, 25, 26, and 2 Pet. iii. 10. These are highly metaphorical expressions which frequently occur in the sacred Scriptures. Of them the truly learned Jewish Rabbi, Maimonides thus observes, "these expressions are proverbial, importing the destruction or utter ruin of a people or nation." Artemidorus says, "the sun darkened or turned into blood, and stars falling, imply in prophetic language, the destruction of many people." Whitby's Com. vol. 1, gen. pref.

Bishop Warburton, Julian, B. 1. C. 1, observes, the kingdom of Christ succeeded the Jewish theocracy; and till the Jewish law was abolished in which the Father presided as king, the reign of the Son could not take place; because the sovereignty of Christ over men, was the sovereignty of the Father over the Jews, transferred and extended. This being the most important era, in the economy of grace, and the most awful revolution in all God's religious dispensations, we see the elegance and propriety of the terms to denote so great an event, together with the destruction of Jerusalem, by which it was effected. For in the old prophetic language, the change or fall of principalities and powers, whether spiritual or civil, is signified by the shaking of the heavens and the earth; darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars. The rise and establishment of new kingdoms or empires, by processions in the clouds of heaven, by the sounding of trumpets, and the assembling together of hosts and nations."

This perfectly accounts for the gathering of the elect; the awakening of the dead; the meeting of the Lord in the air; and the sounding of the trumpet; all implying the establishment of Christianity, or the kingdom of Jesus on the ruins of the Jewish dispensation.

The same venerable writer, Div. Leg. vol. 2, b. 4, says, "This language was borrowed from the ancient hieroglyphics, in which the sun, moon, and stars, were used to represent states and empires,

kings, queens, and nobility; their eclipse or extinction, denoted temporary disasters, or their entire overthrow. In like manner, the holy prophets, called kings and empires by the names of the heavenly luminaries. Their misfortunes and overthrow were represented by eclipses and extinction; stars falling from the firmament, are employed to denote the destruction of the nobility. In one word, the prophetic style seems to be a kind of speaking hieroglyphic."

Maimonides assigns the following reason for such phraseology. "As Isaiah, xxx. 26, speaking of such as had been conquered, says, their sun and moon have lost their light; so he says also of conquerors; their sun and moon increase their light. For experience proves that the eyes of men, in great misery, grow dim, and not see the light in its full splendour; the nerves being weakened, by want of spirits. On the other hand, when by joy the soul is enlarged, and the animal spirits are conveyed in abundance to the organs of vision, the sun and light appear greater than before."

Let us now look into our bibles and we shall see these opinions both confirmed and illustrated. Isaiah, predicting the destruction of Babylon, xiii. 10, says, "*The stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth; and the moon shall not cause her light to shine.*" Again, describing the destruction of Idumea, he says, xxxiv. 5, "*All the host of heaven shall be dissolved; and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fall as the leaf falleth from the vine, and as the falling fig from the fig-tree.*" Ezekiel foretels the destruction of Egypt in the following language, xxxii. 7, 8, "*I will cover the heaven and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light. All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and set darkness upon thy land saith the Lord God.*" Joel, describing the destruction of Jerusalem, adopts similar terms, ii. 10, 30, 31. "*The earth shall quake before them, (i. e. the Romans;) the heavens shall tremble, the sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining. I will show wonders in the heavens, and on the earth blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.*" Now as Peter applies part of Joel's prophecy to the events of the day of Pentecost, and Joel declares that in those same days and that time the other signs should be manifested, we have no reason to protract the remaining part of the prophe-

cy longer than the destruction of Jerusalem, which followed soon afterwards.

In allusion to the above prophecies, especially that of Joel, our Lord predicted fearful signs, and shakings of the earth and heavens. But as several of the signs, foretold by our Lord, were designed to warn the disciples, many of them literally happened. So Josephus, L. 4, ch. 17, informs us of a dreadful tempest, frequent lightnings, terrible thunderings; roarings of the sea, and quakings of the earth. That armies were seen in the clouds, in battle array, and compassing the city; and that a comet pointed its fiery tail down upon the city, for a whole year, portending its ruin. L. 7, ch. 31. Tacitus, the Roman historian, says, the temple seemed to be in flames, by fire issuing from the clouds. L. 5, p. 621.

Though some of the signs of our Lord's coming were literally fulfilled, because without a figure they were described in the prediction; yet the description in general is highly symbolical. That the stars falling from heaven, emblematically represented the overthrow of the Jewish rulers and teachers, evidently appears from the following passages of scripture. Daniel says, the little horn waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. viii. 10. Isaiah describes the king of Babylon as saying, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. xiv. 13. The tail of the great red dragon drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth. Rev. xii. 4. I need not multiply citations to prove that stars were symbols of religious teachers. The single reference to Rev. i. 20, is abundantly sufficient. Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Hammond, having referred the language of Peter, concerning the coming of Christ, in the third chapter of his second epistle, to the destruction of Jerusalem; and Mr. Le Clerc having exposed the fanciful application of this chapter and some other parts of scripture to an imaginary future general judgment yet to come; Dr. Whitby seemed somewhat offended, yet promised to be more friendly with his learned opponents, in his commentary on the gospels. He admits the application of Peter's predictions to the destruction of Anti-Christ, Rev. 17th chapter. After which, in his opinion, follow the new heavens and the new earth. But had the Dr. sufficiently considered the subject, and maintained consistency in his own theories, he would have been forced to admit that the new heaven and new earth denoted that new order of things which succeeded the abolition of the Jewish heavens and earth, or ecclesiastical and civil polities. Then all the elements of that dispensation melted with fervent heat, and the heavens, or Mosaic dispensation, passed away with a great noise. This great event was undoubtedly the object of Haggai's prophecy, ii. 7, cited by Paul, Heb. xii. 26, where, and on 2 Thess. ii. 1, Whitby entirely concedes the disputed ground to his opponents by remarking that "this shaking of the heavens and earth cannot mean the subversion of the material world, but is a metaphor, usually adopted by the prophets to denote the entire overthrow of a state or kingdom." No man can be

surprised by the third chapter of Peter's second epistle, who reads the following scriptures, Isa. xlii. 13. I will shake the heavens, and the earth will remove out of her place, in the day of his fierce anger. Psa. lxxvii. 18. The voice of thy thunder was in the heavens, the lightnings lightened the world; the earth trembled and shook. Isa. xxiv. 19, 20. The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved and moved like a cottage. Jer. iv. 23, 24. I beheld the earth, and lo! it was without form and void; the heavens and the earth had no light. Now the context most manifestly shows that this language was descriptive of the destruction of nations; and if ever such language apply to the subversion of any people, certainly to the Jewish. About 2,000,000 perished in the city of Jerusalem, by Titus; and in the eighteenth year of Trajan, the Jews having made sedition, in Lybia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, that war, says Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. L. 1, c. 12, extinguished *pollas myriadas Joudaion*, many myriads of the Jews. From the 16th to the 18th of Adrian, they again rebelled, and then were almost utterly exterminated, and prohibited ever to return to Judea. On attempting to recover their favoured country, he ordered their ears to be cut off, their bodies to be marked as rebels, and dispersed them as slaves through all the provinces of the empire. According to the best authorities, more perished in the war against Adrian, than in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Thus was awfully accomplished the prediction of our Lord, Wherever the carcass, the Jewish people, is, there will the eagles, the Roman army, be gathered together. Luke xvii. 37.

Another sign of the coming of the Son of Man was, great earthquakes in divers places. Luke xxi. 11. Of these significant emblems of political commotions, there occurred several within the scene of this prophecy, and according to the prediction in divers places. In the reign of Claudius there was one at Rome, and another in Apamea, in Syria, both recorded by Tacitus; and Philostratus in his life of Appollonius, mentions one in Crete, others at Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos; in all of which places Jews had settled. During the reign of Nero, there was one in Campania, and another at Laodicea, both noticed by Tacitus; the latter is also mentioned by Eusebius and Grotius, who add that Hierapolis and Colosse, as well as Laodicea, were overthrown by an earthquake. There was also another in the reign of Galba, recorded by Suetonius. Josephus also informs us, that "in the awful night when the Idumeans were excluded from Jerusalem, a heavy storm burst on them, violent winds, incessant torrents of rain, constant lightnings, and most tremendous thunderings, and roarings of earthquakes, as if the system of the world had been confounded to effect the destruction of mankind; so that one might have easily conjectured that these were signs of no common events."

Another sign was, that the Gospel should be preached to all the world, and then should the end come. Matt. xxiv. 14. Of the fulfilment of this prediction, the epistles of Paul addressed to the

Christians of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica; and those of Peter to those in Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, are standing monuments. Paul tells the Romans their faith was spoken of throughout the world; and the Colossians, that the gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven. The Acts of the Apostles, written seven years before the destruction of Jerusalem, attest the fact, that the gospel had been preached to all the then known world. Bishop Newton observes, that the history of the church shows, that before the destruction of Jerusalem, the gospel had been propagated northward, to Scythia, southward to Ethiopia, eastward to India, and westward to Spain and Britain. Moreover, both Eusebius and Theodoret attest, that the apostles preached the gospel in the Britaninic isles. Doddridge, in his note on the passage says, it appears from the most credible records that the gospel was preached in Mesopotamia, Idumea, and Syria, by Jude; in Egypt, Mauritania, and other parts of Africa, by Mark, Simon, and Jude; in Ethiopia, by Matthias and Candace's Eunuch; in Pontus, Galatia, and other parts of Asia, by Peter; in the territories of the seven Asiatic churches, by John; in Parthia, by Matthew; in Scythia by Philip and Andrew; in the northern and western parts of Asia, by Bartholomew; in Persia, by Simon and Jude; in Media, Carmania, and other parts of the east, by Thomas; from Jerusalem, round the vast tract, to Illyricum, by Paul; in Spain, Gaul, and Britain, in all probability, by the apostles; and in all which places churches had been planted within thirty years after the death of Christ, and ten before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The last sign of Christ's coming, which I shall notice, was that false Christs should arise and seduce many, and thereby occasion a great apostacy. Matt. xxiv. 5, 11, Luke xxi. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 7, 8. Before the destruction of Jerusalem, false Christs did arise, as Simon Magnus, who pretended to be the Son of God, who had in appearance been crucified in Judea. Others are mentioned by Luke, Acts v. 36, 37, and xxi. 38. This Egyptian noticed by Luke, was probably the same described by Josephus, who led away 30,000 Jews whom he had deceived. Ant. L. 20, c. 6. But the most distinguished was Barchocheba, whom the Jews crowned king in the city Bitter. This impostor occasioned a greater slaughter of the Jews, than had happened at the capture of their city by Titus. See Buxtor on the words Choziba and Bitter. John says, *Little children, ye have heard that Anti-Christ should come, even now there are many Anti-Christ in the world whereby we know that it is the last time; Anti-Christ of whom ye have heard, even now already is in the world.* John ii. 18, 2d Epis. 7. Here we find Anti-Christ was in the world before the destruction of Jerusalem, and consequently the apostacy existed then also, and we need not labour to find another date. Accordingly, Grotius, Wetstein, Hammond, Le Clerc, and Whitby, all agree to fix the time of the apostacy before the dispersion of the Jewish nation. Consequently the Jewish people

was that man of sin, or, as many good MSS. read, *anomis* of disobedience, who made defection from the Roman state and religion of Jesus, and were therefore consumed by the brightness of his coming. Hence we conclude from the testimony of history, scripture, and the best commentators, that the signs of Christ's coming, as well as that great event itself, took place at the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and temple services.

4. The design of Christ's coming, or the transactions of his advent.

1. The design of Christ's coming, according to the English version of my text, was to take vengeance on them who knew not God, nor obeyed the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here Paul refers to the language of Christ, Luke xxi. 22, where describing the awful catastrophe which should befall the Jewish nation, Jesus said, "these be the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled." Hence the language of our Lord and his apostle must relate to the same event; for Paul referring to the same transaction, uses the same word to express the same idea. By comparing these passages with Luke xvii. 30, we are induced to limit the whole history to the destruction of Jerusalem; and no other interpretation of the text should be admitted. The phrase *taking vengeance*, I have rendered *administering justice*, of the propriety of the alteration, let those who are qualified to judge determine; but let all who are ignorant, have decency enough to keep silence. The English phrase is most unequivocally a perversion and abuse of the Greek *didontos ekdikesin*, which signifies to give or administer justice, and consequently cannot mean the reverse, or taking. Paul had said in the sixth verse, it was just in God to recompense tribulation to the persecuting Jews, but rest to the persecuted Christians. Here he repeats the same ideas by declaring Christ would administer justice, i. e. tribulation to the persecutor irreverent and disobedient. The disobedience of the Jews was strongly marked by Paul, who calls them the *man of sin*, or as the MSS. of Stephanus and Lincoln read, *anomis of disobedience*. In those days the Jews were proverbially disobedient, both in the political and religious sense of that term. Hence the apostle says, 2 Thess. ii. 8, then, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus, *will the wicked be revealed*; the Jewish nation or man of disobedience, by their rebellion against the Roman government and apostacy from the Christian religion, *whom the Lord will consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy by the brightness of his coming*. Jesus predicted that, *except these days of vengeance, should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's or Christian's sake the days shall be shortened.* Matt. xxiv. 22. The banditti who made continual excursions from the mountain, and zealots who murdered all that were averse to the war, greatly contributed to depopulate the country and harass the Christians; but the days were shortened. 1. By the determination of Titus vigorously to push the siege by assault. 2. By the dissensions of the Jews, who accelerated the capture of their city, by

intestine divisions and mutual slaughters. 3. By the madness of the factions in burning their store houses, and thereby wasting the strength-necessary for the defence of the place. 4. By the extraordinary panic which siezed the Jews, when the Romans attacked the upper city, in consequence of which, they fled from their strong holds, which Titus afterwards pronounced invulnerable. 5. By the crowded state of the city during the siege, which occasioned pestilential disorders, and hastened the approach of famine; the number of its inhabitants on account of the great festival, being swelled to about 3,000,000.

(To be concluded.)

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

LIFE OF DR. CHAUNCY.

(Concluded from p. 366.)

In 1771, Chauncy published the *Complete View of Episcopacy*, which was commenced nearly thirty years before. It contains an historical account of the Christian Fathers and of their writings down to the close of the second century; and faithfully exhibits, by extracts, all they say concerning *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; from which the author shewed that they considered these as one and the same order of ecclesiastical officers. It is a learned and faithful statement of the subject, as adapted to the capacity of common readers. An answer to it has, I think, never been attempted, except by Mr. Bowden, rector of St. Paul's Church in Norwalk, Con. who was manifestly incompetent to the undertaking.

The difficulties between Great Britain and America had now assumed a fearful aspect, and the *period which tried men's souls* arrived. Through that long protracted scene of hope and despair, Chauncy remained a firm supporter of the cause of freedom, though his advanced age, forbade his taking a very active part. He used to say, that if human exertions were insufficient to protect the Americans, a legion of angels would be sent to their assistance; and when a smile was excited, and some doubts were expressed of the possibility of such an alliance, he persisted in his assertion, adding that he *knew it would be so*. Amidst all his studies, he had ever been a careful observer of public affairs; on which he had formerly published some tracts. When General Gage shut up the harbor of Boston, and harassed the inhabitants with his troops, Chauncy published (1774) *A just Representation of the Hardships and Sufferings of the Town of Boston*, in a letter to a friend.

Towards the close of the Revolutionary war, he grew unable to perform the public duties of the ministry;* and, warned by his increasing infirmities that his earthly labours must soon end, employed his leisure in preparing those works for the press, which were commenced during his seven year's study. Of these, it has been already mentioned that his treatise on *The Salvation of All Men* was one. "This" says Dr. Clarke, "was the most laboured, and, in

Chauncy's opinion, the most valuable, of his numerous productions. It was begun in early life, often reviewed, and completed at a time when the mental powers are most vigorous." It seems, from Clarke's expressions, that of the clergy of that day, there were several who approved of it, and were believers in its doctrine: "Before its publication," says he, "it underwent a severe examination from those whose *theological* and critical knowledge qualified them to judge of such a work. Many esteemed it a valuable acquisition to the religious world; and all bestowed the highest encomiums upon the learning and ingenuity of the author."

While the work was thus preparing for the press, there appeared in Boston (1782) a small pamphlet, entitled *Salvation for All Men*; which, though anonymous, we may confidently pronounce to have been published by Chauncy. It contains little but extracts from several Universalist writers; and seems designed only to direct the public attention to the doctrine, in season for the appearance of a larger and more convincing treatise. It is remarkable that the author expressed, in the preface, a most *orthodox* dislike and contempt of "a stranger who had, of himself, assumed the character of a preacher," and who taught, in Boston and elsewhere, that "a man may go to heaven, notwithstanding all that he has been guilty of in the course of his life." This stranger was no other than the celebrated Mr. Murray,* a man who, notwithstanding all his imperfections, was entitled to some other notice than this, from Chauncy.

It may be thought that Chauncy regarded the publication of this pamphlet as an experiment that was to determine him whether to prefix his name to his work on Universalism; as by observing how his sentiments were received, he might judge how he should be treated, if known to be the promulgator of them. If this was the case, he did not long remain in suspense; for his pamphlet no sooner appeared than it was warmly attacked; and among others, by Dr. Samuel Mather, who preached in the house now occupied by the First Universalist Society in Boston, and by Dr. Gordon of Roxbury, author of the *History of the American Revolution*. This, I suppose, was the first public controversy on Universalism, which appeared in this country.

At length his treatise on *The Salvation of All Men* was published in London, in 1784, without his name; though it is probable that he, the next year, consented to an advertisement which declared him to be the author.† Of its first reception, either in England or America, I know nothing, except that

* Murray was then settled in Gloucester, Mass.; but he had preached occasionally in Boston ever since the year 1773. Murray takes notice of this pamphlet and its personal reflection. See his works, Vol. ii. page 94.

† At the end of his "Dissertations on the Fall and its Consequences," published with his name, in 1785, in the following advertisement. "Just imported from Boston, New-England, and written by the author of the foregoing Dissertations, I. *The Benevolence of the Deity*, &c. II. *The Mystery hid from Ages*, &c. or, *The Salvation of All Men*, &c.

* Dr. John Clarke was settled a colleague with him in 1778. Mr. Foxcroft died, 1769.

it was approved by the [London] Monthly Reviewers.† It has, however, never been so much read, nor by common readers so highly esteemed, as some other works in support of the same hypothesis. Although more correct in diction than most of Chauncy's writings, its style is too stiff, and its mode of argumentation too dull and prolix, for popular taste. It is, nevertheless, a work of much critical learning, and of some substantial proof;—of uniform candor and fair reasoning. In the first part, he defines his object, which is to prove that all men will be saved, though not till two, or perhaps more, states of future existence shall have passed away. In the second part, he advances to the proof, by means of six propositions: the substance of which is, That the obedience and death of Christ constitute the only medium through which salvation is rendered attainable to fallen man; that Christ yielded obedience and suffered death, not for a part, but for all our race, in accordance with God's purpose to save all; that God will, through Christ, finally reconcile every individual to his moral government; and that, accordingly, whenever the Scriptures speak of those who shall be eventually restored, they use expressions of universal comprehension: such as "all the nations and families of the earth," and "every creature which is in heaven and on the earth," &c. These positions he supports wholly by the testimony of scripture; some passages of which he attempts to illustrate by paraphrases and learned critical notes, sufficiently tedious to defy all patience. In the third and last part, he answers the usual objections against his doctrine, in the usual way; except that he contends that the very terms which are supposed to represent the future state of torment, are such as naturally indicate that it will end; so that, he concludes, we should have been led to believe that the damned would be annihilated, had not the Scriptures taught us that all will be saved.

The chief defect in his system of doctrine may be traced to his misapplication of a class of texts to a future state of torment, which have no allusion but to certain scenes of distress and mental blindness in the present life. In this, he seems to have followed former commentators, without thinking to inquire, even in a single instance, whether they were correct. But after all, the real *principle* of his system is that which is now adopted by most Universalists; while that of Rely and Huntington is generally rejected.

To this book, the younger president Edwards published, in 1790, an answer which has been considered the ablest work that ever appeared against Universalism. Were I to give its character, however, I should say that its arguments are often founded on scholastic theology, rather than on simple truth; and that, while it evinces much ability, it fails of affecting Chauncy's general system, though it exposes some heterogeneous notions in it. It is certain that Edwards either mistook or misrepresented Chauncy's meaning on several important points.

In the same year (1784) Chauncy's treatise on the *Benevolence of the Deity*, was published in Boston. This work, which is a metaphysical one, embraces a much wider range of thought than any other which he ever wrote; and if the confusion in its arrangement be overlooked, it must be acknowledged an able production even by those with whose views it does not entirely agree. After explaining the nature of infinite benevolence, considered as an attribute of Deity, he proceeds to show that the great system of Nature and divine government in our world, is such as we might expect would result from the exercise of that benevolence. For this purpose, he takes a survey of the construction of the material world and of the general laws of nature and providence; and then attempts to show that the whole is so adapted to the constitution of sensitive and rational creatures, as naturally to produce their happiness, and promote it to as great a degree as is possible, considering that they are but a part of the vast connexion of beings, and that this life is only preparatory to a future. He zealously contends, however, that the natural tendency of things is much retarded by the perverseness of free-agents; and seems to admit that the system of this world is necessarily imperfect, though most of its irregularities are eventually corrected by the operation of those general laws which produced them. He was evidently somewhat embarrassed, and certainly prevented from fully displaying his own plan, by anxiety to avoid an avowal of Universalism. He did not hesitate, however, to attack the doctrine of predestination and eternal reprobation; but, I think, with more zeal than success.

The next year (1785) his *five Dissertations on the Fall and its Consequences*, was published in London. This is the work to which some mutilated references* may be found in his treatise on "The Salvation of All Men." He contends that Adam was created with neither holiness nor knowledge, but only with a capacity to acquire them; that by his transgression, he incurred the threatened death, which, though delayed, was at length executed upon him, and the earth and seasons cursed for his sake; that his posterity inherit from him a nature which, though not morally corrupt, is less qualified for obedience than his was originally, and that they were subjected, by the necessary consequence of his transgression, to all the unavoidable sorrows of this life and to death itself; but that Christ has unconditionally ensured to mankind a release from death, and has brought to them new terms of justification, which demand so much less than strict law would require, as mankind are now less qualified for obedience than Adam was at first; so that by improving their advantages, they may repair the damage which results to them from the fall.

The whole of this book is at variance with what is called *orthodoxy*, and contains much conclusive argument against the doctrine of original holiness,

† See the "Monthly Review," for Sept. 1784.

* See "The Salvation of All Men," pages 46, 79, and 109.

original sin† and total depravity. It is generally written in an easier style than Chauncy was accustomed to.

On the completion of these publications, Chauncy was eighty years old. Becoming apprehensive that his life must soon close, he employed the greater part of his time in devotional exercises; until, worn out with age, he expired on the 10th of February, 1787, in his 83d year. His last moments, like the rest of his life, were cheered by a constant hope of a glorious resurrection to life and immortality; and his language was that of the great apostle whom he so much venerated: "I am now ready to be offered; and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

He left a number of manuscripts on theological subjects, which have never been published.

Dr. Chauncy was one of the most learned and eminent divines of New England. No one among them, except President Edwards and Dr. Mayhew, was so much known to the literati of Europe. He is still remembered by the liberal clergy, as "a burning and a shining light," that contributed to the illumination of his own age, and prepared the way for the greater splendor of the present. His mind was strong and steady, capable of hard and constant labour; he possessed an untiring patience in investigation, and a resolution which nothing could overcome; but in quickness of apprehension and vigor of conception, he was somewhat deficient; and of taste almost destitute.

His passions were strong, and his temper overbearing though not petulant. In conversation, a little opposition roused him to vehemence, when he was apt to indulge unguarded and extravagant expressions. In his controversial writings, however, he appears cool. He was greatly respected for the general excellence of his character; and particularly for his uprightness, kindness, and piety.

MARCUS.

N. B. In the former part of this Biographical Sketch, I have sometimes availed myself of Emerson's language, with no other acknowledgment than this.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

"But let a man examine himself and so let him eat of the bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29.

The reader by examining the Assembly's Catechism, will find that the word *damnation* is there rendered judgment. We believe it may with equal propriety be rendered condemnation; for we read that "He that doubteth is (in the present tense)

damned." Again, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Again, "He that believeth not (or doubteth) is condemned (or damned) already." "And this (saith our Saviour) is the condemnation (or damnation) that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." It is evident then, that the word *damnation*, which is so often thundered from the obstreperous lungs of fanatics, is simply condemnation. Then "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." As all men are sinners, as "There are none righteous, no, not one;" and as "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight;" then all are *unworthy*, and, if they eat and drink, eat and drink unworthily. Therefore it is evident, that the Apostle's meaning was, "He that eateth and drinketh without faith, or unbelievingly, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself. This is evident from the words that immediately follow, "*Not discerning the Lord's body.*" What then is the Lord's body? Can it be expected that those who partake of the Lord's Supper discern the material body of Jesus; that body which contained his immortal spirit while on the earth? No, the idea is puerile.

What then, is the Lord's body, to which the apostle alluded? It is the whole family of man, that body of which he is the head. For it is declared, that "He is the head of every man." Again, that it was given him "to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." See Ephesians ii. Again—1 Cor. xii. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many (not a few elect, chosen out of the world) are one body; so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond (slaves to sin) or free, (believers in Christ) and have been all made to drink into one spirit. For the body is not one member but many." Again, "But now are they many members, yet but one body." Again, "And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular." Why in particular? Because they were believers and many of them ministers, or chosen vessels, and particularly appointed by God to bear to the world "Glad tidings of good things."

It cannot be successfully contended, that all mankind are not his members, and therefore not included in the body of Jesus; for we not only read that "He is the head of every man," but also, that "He is the head over all things, to the church which is his body." Therefore the body of which Christ is the head, is every man, and every man of which Christ is the head, is the body, and "it is the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Did those then, who partake of the Lord's Supper, discern the Lord's body, they would not eat and drink condemnation to themselves, for they would see themselves justified through Christ, and perceive that they themselves

† President Edwards' doctrine of original sin, is examined to considerable length, and its absurdity clearly pointed out.

are members, and comprise a part of this glorious body. They would be convinced that Christ will not give his own body, or even one member of it, (for "if one member suffer all the members suffer with it,") over to never-ending woe and agony.—Were it advocated that sinners would be tortured by hellish fiends with flames and sulphur, for the term of a thousand millions of years for every moment they existed on the earth, what would be my fearful horror and dismay, did I believe it! But O! where would my affrighted spirit fly for shelter, did I believe in the still more unmerciful doctrine of *endless* woe and everlasting wretchedness! Was it for this God spake man into existence? Was it for this he called him from the silence of nonentity? *No.* *Horrid* is the idea beyond description. Blasphemous and God-dishonouring indeed! Do we not read that "the seed of the woman (Christ) shall bruise the serpent's head?" Do not those who advocate the heart-appalling doctrine of *endless* woe; teach, that Christ's errand was to *save* the world? Do they not also teach that it is the object of Satan to damn the world? Yes. Who then will gain the victory, Christ or the adversary? Do not they acknowledge that it is the design of Christ to bruise the serpent's head? And also that it is the object of Satan to bruise or afflict for ever the body of Christ? And will he not accomplish it if he be permitted to exercise his endless ire over many, or even one of Christ's members; "for if one member suffer, all the members (or the whole body) suffer with it?" Instead of Christ's effecting his design and bruising the serpent's head, we are taught by this horrid doctrine, that the reverse will be effected. That the body of *Christ* will be *bruised* and afflicted for ever, and the accursed, yet infinite head of Satan shall not be *bruised*, but be *crowned*, and he shall eternally reign and rage in the Pandemonium of hell!

Although I write with some warmth against the soul agonizing doctrine of merciless misery, yet I cherish no antipathy against those who contend for its validity. Multitudes of them are well meaning people, and some of them are my best and most esteemed friends. May they be enabled to discern the extent and fulness of the Lord's body, and may God manifest himself unto them in all his immutable loveliness.

S. R. SIBLEY.

From the (Hartford) Religious Inquirer.

"At Saugar-island, formerly, mothers were seen casting their living offspring among a number of alligators, and standing to gaze at these monsters quarrelling for their prey, beholding the writhing infant in the jaws of the successful animal, and standing motionless while it was breaking the bones and sucking the blood of the poor innocent! What must be that *superstition* which can thus transform a being, whose distinguishing quality is *tenderness*, into a *monster* more *unnatural* than the tiger prowling through the forest for its prey!"

Ward's Letters, page 79.

If human nature is *totally depraved*, this conduct of the mother is perfectly *NATURAL*. If it is not, dreadful indeed must be that *superstition* which can

produce such effects. "Can a mother forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?" is a question which calls all the tender sympathies of human nature into exertion. What mother, with this question before her, does not answer in the negative—while the tear of affection trembles in her eye? What mother, whose softer nature has not been led astray by the doctrine of devils, does not, in agony, strain the infant to her beating bosom, while the bare possibility of thus neglecting her charge disturbs not merely the tender sensibilities of her nature, but her reason also.

But what says the word, of *inspiration*—"yea, they *may* forget, yet will I not forget thee." Facts, dreadful as they are, prove, that pagan mothers *do* forget—that the veil of superstition has closed their eyes to the bonds of maternal duty; and that a "deceived heart" hath turned them aside from the first, the tenderest sympathies of our nature. But has this unhallowed superstition reached no further? Have not mothers, called Christian, been so far under the influence of a false religion, or rather priestcraft, as to be the executioners of their own children—that, dying while young, they may escape an *eternity* of misery! Surely the ghosts of Mrs. Stone's three children witness this dreadful delusion, nor are they alone the victims of that baleful doctrine which claims the palm of orthodoxy. Happy indeed it is for the community, that this system of doctrine almost universally "plays around the head but comes not to the heart," while such are the dreadful consequences of a sincere belief in its truth.

But why lament this superstition—are we not taught "that in a future state the elect will shout a loud amen to the sentence of inexpressible and interminable woe, which will be pronounced on the reprobate—to whom by the incomprehensible but yet irreprehensible decree of God, the entry into life is blocked up?" These heathen mothers are only in advance of the perfection of the elect in christendom—they merely habituate themselves to the scenes of *momentary sufferings*, as a preparatory step to that species of perfection which lies in prospect before those who declare that parents and children—husbands and wives—ministers and people—and all the tenderest relations in society shall be separated; and the benevolence of the Christian heart be changed for the diabolical feelings which are above expressed. Is it not, my christian fellows, giving us a "sorry heaven, at an unreasonable price?" May God in mercy grant us wisdom to pull the beam from our own eye, that we may see clearly to pull the mote from our brother's eye, and before we send missionaries to teach others humanity and religion, learn to practice "the precepts of Jesus."

PUBLIC TEACHING.

"When he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue." MATT. XIII. 54.

It is variously related of Christ and his apostles, that they addressed or spoke to the people in the Jewish synagogues. It is said, there were 460 synagogues at Jerusalem; and the smaller towns and

cities had their synagogues, or places for reading and expounding the law, and teaching the people. It is remarkable that the Jews, with all their bigotry, were willing to give their opponents, or those who differed with them in sentiment, a hearing, and admitted them to speak in their meeting houses. Were the bigoted stiff-necked Jews more liberal than modern Christians? How shall this question be answered? Can it be answered to the credit of modern professors, who refuse to hear, or to permit those who *sincerely* differ with them in sentiment, to speak, in the houses where they have the control?

Christ, whom Christians of the present day profess to imitate, never acted like a bigot; nor rejected any from pride or petulance. His dignity and honour was not dependent on the opinions and caprice of men. He uniformly regarded all with affection, and none were by him considered too mean and abject to deserve his notice. Universalists are rejected by bigots, and refused an opportunity to defend their sentiments, and explain their views. Heaven, in mercy, defend them from the invasion of the uncharitable spirit which rankles in the bosom of their religious foes.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—Please to insert the following letter in your paper, and oblige a Subscriber.

Newburgh, March 22, 1824.

To Mr. J. Wilson:

Sir, on Friday evening last, I heard you preach from Heb. ix. 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." After naming your text, you assured your hearers, that you would confine yourself to *facts*, and draw your conclusions from them alone. For a moment I felt interested, until, to my astonishment, you palmed upon your audience, for facts, news direct from heaven and hell. You substituted your extravagant imagination for the Scriptures, and summoned the *spirits* of departed men to appear, to answer to your wild interrogations, and to advance such testimony in relation to another world, as you, their *proxy*, deemed convenient and suitable for the occasion! Were you aware of the *farce* you were playing? Is this preaching the *gospel*, to pretend that the spirits of the deceased are giving their testimony, and proving the reality of your baseless visions? Is this attempt at the marvellous calculated to enlighten the understandings of men? or to work upon passions which disgrace mankind, and torment them, whenever they are exercised?

I have taken this liberty with you, and your sermon, Sir, for the purpose of exciting an inquiry into the merits of your extraordinary performance, in the minds of a free and enlightened public.

I am, Sir, with much respect, your friend; also,

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

QUESTIONS FOR TRINITARIANS.

Our trinitarian friends who worship in the Episcopal form, after the Church of England, in repeating their Litany, say, they supplicate the mercy of

God—by his holy nativity, and circumcision—by his fastings and temptations—by his agony and bloody sweat—by his precious death and burial.

Please to answer—Do you really believe that God was *born*? Do you believe that God was *circumcised*? That God *fasted*, and was *tempted*? Do you believe that God was in an *agony* of pain, and sweat *blood*? Do you believe that God *died*, and was *buried*? If you believe these things, you outrage reason, and deny the Scriptures. If you do not believe them, why do you make a solemn mockery of absurdity?

We make this appeal to reasonable beings. Let every rational person ponder well these things, before they shall again address the Great JEHOVAH in this unjustifiable and absurd manner.

SWEARING.

St. Chrysostom proposes a singular method to facilitate the leaving off of this practice of customary swearing. "Wouldst thou know," says the father, "by what means thou mayest get rid of this wicked custom of swearing, I'll tell thee a way, which, if thou wilt take, will certainly prove successful. Every time whenever thou shalt find thyself to have let slip an oath, punish thyself for it by missing the next meal. Such a course as this, though troublesome to the flesh, will be profitable to the spirit; and cause a quick amendment; for the tongue will need no other monitor to make it take heed of swearing another time if it hath been thus punished with hunger and thirst for its former transgression, and knows it shall be so punished again if ever it commits the like crime hereafter." *Register.*

NICE DISTINCTION.

Fides sola justificat sed non fides quæ sola est.

"It is indeed faith *alone* that justifies us, but not that *faith* which is alone."

It required the wisdom of a *modern* theologist to generate this sentiment.

New Society—A new Society by the name of "The First Society of Universal Restorationists," has been lately formed at Lempster, (N. H.)

Chris. Repos.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"The Second Death"—Rev. xk. 14.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

Distant Subscribers who are in arrears for the Gospel Herald, are informed, that they can forward the sums due, per mail, directed to James Hall, Treasurer, No. 454 Pearl-street, New-York, without paying the postage. No objection can now remain to this mode of conveyance, on account of the expense.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS

PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL

HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1824.

NO. 48.

MR. WOODWORTH'S REPLY,

(Continued from p. 325.)

1. In our last number we disposed of *ten paragraphs* of Mr. Fitz's remarks, and shall now proceed with a few more. It is hoped that our readers will have patience: we are sensible that to many who are in the truth, this controversy is like a useless waste of time and paper; but we can assure them that it has not been unproductive of good effects. The ludicrous shifts to which we have driven our opponent, have already opened the eyes of many of his friends. Truth is mighty and must prevail.

2. In his *eleventh* paragraph, Mr. Fitz exultingly asks, "*What has man done?*" To this question we reply, that many men have done what the apostle beseeches his Corinthian brethren to do, viz. "become reconciled to God," and "walk in newness of life." Many men have done what the Scriptures require of every man; viz—they have "put away the evil of their doings;" not merely their *doings*, but the *evil motives* from which they originated; they have "ceased to do evil, and learned to do well;" they have repented of their past sins, and, by faithful perseverance, overcome every inclination to commit such sins in future; they have subdued, and keep under subjection, the evil affections of their own hearts; they have ceased to love themselves and the world, more than God and their neighbours, and have learned to love God above all things, and their neighbour as themselves; thus they have entered into life by keeping the commandments, for "love is the fulfilling of the law;" and "in keeping the commandments [not for keeping them] is great reward." They "have passed from death unto life;" they have "fought the good fight," they first believed, and were then baptized, not with water merely, but with truth and goodness, or with the holy *spirit* and with *fire*." They "opened the door" at the knocking of the Lord; they heard the word of God, and *did it*. In short—they have *co-operated with God in the great work of purifying their own hearts*, and have, consequently, become the recipients of his love and wisdom; and are now the happy subjects of his blessed kingdom on earth, or in the heavens. This is what *man has done* in thousands of instances; this is what every man *can* do, by power which is continually given him from above; and this is what man *must* do, or he "can never see the kingdom of God;" because this is the only method by which he can "become reconciled to God," and the only *condition* on which he can "receive the atonement." A compliance with this condition will alone *obtain it*.

3. In his *twelfth* paragraph Mr. F. asks what we

"mean by *immortality*?" Let this question be settled at once—We mean exemption from death—life never to end—a conscious existence that shall never cease. Does it necessarily follow, that an existence which can never cease must be a series of uninterrupted felicity? We think not.

4. It is readily granted that in the correspondential, significative, and figurative language of the Bible, heaven and hell, love and hate, wisdom and folly, goodness and evil, truth and error, righteousness and wickedness, and a host of other *opposites*, are often designated (when applied to spiritual subjects) by the terms *life* and *death*, for no other words could *contrast* them so strikingly and effectually. In addition to this, let it be remembered, that properly speaking, *life* belongs to the Divine Being alone, for *he alone has life in himself*—or life underived; and all other beings are only *recipients* of life from him. But we receive and manifest this life variously, each one according to the state of his affections. In this respect, we are like *mirrors*; for when the pure light of the sun is received by a spotted, stained, or imperfect glass, it is reflected in a perverted, discoloured, disordered, and imperfect manner; while the same light, reflected from a more pure and perfect mirror, will retain more of its original purity and perfection. So the *life* which the wicked and unregenerate receive from the Lord, is reflected or manifested, in evil and falsehood; while the "pure in heart" manifest the same life in goodness and truth. Thus the same heat, light, and moisture, which the rose receives and exhales in perfume, is turned to deadly poison by the somnific properties of the poppy; and the same juices which the bee converts to honey, become venom in the recipient organs of the spider.

5. As all life is from the Lord, who alone hath life in himself, therefore, the Apostle says that *Jesus Christ alone hath immortality*, though Mr. Fitz would make his readers believe that Jesus Christ was a *mere man!!!* Hear what Paul says to Timothy, for he addresses him as if a human being could do *something*: "Follow after righteousness, godliness, faith—*lay hold on eternal life*." Paul had an idea that Timothy could do all this, or he certainly would not have exhorted him to do it; and we never heard that Timothy replied "*Man can do nothing. Hallelujah!*" But hear Paul further: "Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in his times he shall show; the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; *who only hath immortality*, [or life in himself:] dwelling in the light [the ineffable divinity] which

no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen or can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting, Amen." 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12, 16.

6. Thus it appears, from apostolic testimony, that Jesus Christ alone hath immortality; in other words, that he alone hath life in himself, for the Father, or Divine Love is in him, agreeably to his own declaration; "I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" John xiv. 11. Again, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;" John v. 26. And again, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father;" John iv. 9. And yet again, "I and my Father are one." John x. 30. All other beings receive life from him, by *continual and perpetual influx*, as the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms of our earth receive their life from the natural sun. Angels, men, and devils, all receive life from the same divine fountain; but as the streams become more or less adulterated by the channels through which they flow, this life is manifested differently, according to their affection for the good or evil. This life flows into them eternally, and consequently this life is *immortality*; a glorious immortality to the regenerate, and a never ending life of shame, degradation, and woe, to the wilfully impenitent. Those who have followed their Lord in the regeneration, and who have become new creatures in Christ, manifest this life in the light of truth, by deeds that "are wrought in God; while those who remain dead in the deeds of the old man, manifest it in darkness, because they "hate the light, neither come to the light, lest their deeds should be reprov'd."

7. All who wilfully remain in a natural or unregenerated state, are said to "die in Adam;" and all who fly from it by repentance, conversion, reformation, and regeneration, become 'alive in Christ.' "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Again—"If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." All who attribute goodness and truth to themselves, thus die in Adam, for this was the sin of the Adamic Church; whereas all who lead a good life, and acknowledge from the heart, that it is the Lord who "worketh in them to will and to do of his own good pleasure," are made alive in Christ, and become new creatures; with them old things are passed away, and all things are become new. But, says our Lord, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life;" by which we are taught that with him who denies the *divinity* of Jesus Christ, life is turned into death, as the sweetest juices of the most wholesome vegetable are perverted to venom by the very reptiles whose existence they sustain.

8. Thus Mr. Fitz may see, if he will suffer the scales of prejudice to fall from his mental eyes, that it is possible for a man to live for ever, without "believing on the Son of God;" and that while some are made alive in Christ, by a faithful seeking of "those things which are above," others, alas! remain for ever out of Christ, by wilfully hiding their talent in the earth, hoping to be saved by merely exclaiming "Lord, Lord." These latter exist in a state of "outer darkness, where there is

weeping and gnashing of teeth;" and this state, compared with a life of heaven, is very properly denominated *death*. Mr. Fitz may rest assured, that it is impossible for man to be made "alive in Christ," and raised to the resurrection of life, (Christ says, I am the resurrection and the life) until he has become "conjoined to the Lord" by love, faith, and obedience.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS.

Mr. W.'s second paragraph is made up of positive assertions. Mr. W. says, of the "only condition on which man can receive the atonement," that it is "to co-operate with God in the great work of purifying their own hearts." He declares that "this is the only method by which he can 'become reconciled to God.'"

It is now a proper time to give Mr. W. credit for consistency. He professes to labour "for the dissemination of the heavenly doctrines of the New Jerusalem, as contained in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg." It is not the gospel of Christ, but of Swedenborg, which Mr. W. preaches. Now we labour to disseminate the doctrine of Christ, as taught by all God's holy prophets and apostles. Therefore, we offer the following as testimony, in opposition to Mr. Swedenborg, and his disciple Mr. Woodworth. Rom. v. 11. "We also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." Of reconciliation, Paul says, of God's method, that it is not to impute their transgressions unto them; that is, unto the world. Thus Mr. Swedenborg's disciple, and Christ's disciple are at issue!

Mr. W.'s third paragraph settles the question, as he says, at once. Sir, we take your definition of the term *immortality*. "Exemption from death—life never to end—a conscious existence." We will tell you, Sir, what "necessarily follows." It follows, that in your sixth paragraph, you define *immortality* to signify *divine love!!!* Divine love in all! Sir, we congratulate you on slipping, for once, on the side of truth, in opposition to the absurd errors of your master. 'Immortality is exemption from death.' Our Bible says, "To be carnally minded is death." All men, therefore, by your own confession, will be exempt from the *carnal mind*, which "is enmity against God," and is not subject to his law. They will all be subject to God's law, for all will be *immortal*, and immortality is Divine Love. If this will not produce "uninterrupted felicity," we should like to know what will.

Mr. W.'s fourth paragraph is confined to the dissemination of Mr. Swedenborg's doctrine.

Mr. W.'s fifth paragraph is calculated to impose upon and to deceive the reader. He declares, "the apostle says, that Jesus Christ alone hath immortality, though Mr. Fitz would make his readers believe that Jesus Christ was a mere man." We request the reader to examine 1 Tim. vi. 11-16, the intermediate verses of which Mr. W. omitted! He will learn that God only hath immortality. We teach, that Jesus Christ is the "Son of God."

Mr. W.'s sixth paragraph teaches, that "devils

receive life from the same divine fountain;" that "this life flows into them eternally, and consequently this life is *immortality*." Fine logic this: Devils receive *eternal life* from the Divine Fountain, and this life is *immortality*; that is, "the Father, or *Divine Love*." We are of opinion that Mr. W. will confound and disgust every reasonable man who shall read his wonderful expositions.

Mr. W.'s seventh paragraph increases our alarm for his condition. Why, Sir, you are outrageously attacking reason and common sense. You now deny that your *immortal* sinners and devils shall see *life*. And more wonderful still, in your next paragraph you declare, "Thus Mr. Fitz may see, if he will suffer the scales of prejudice to fall from his mental eyes, that it is possible for man to live for ever, without believing on the Son of God." More than this, we are also told of "all being made alive in Christ;" and that "others, alas! remain for ever out of Christ." If Mr. W.'s logic does not bring Mr. Swedenborg's system into disrepute, it will prove to our satisfaction, that absurdity and inconsistency are preferred to reason and truth. We have never been more deeply impressed than we are at present, of the imbecility of unbelievers, and the folly of their attempts to evade the truth.

(To be continued.)

From the (Buffalo) Gospel Advocate.

CHRIST'S COMING TO JUDGMENT.

A Lecture on 2 Thess. i. 6-10. delivered at Rochester, (N. Y.) Nov. 24, 1823, by Br. J. S. THOMPSON.

(Concluded from p. 372.)

The dispersion of the Jewish nation, according to the prediction of Amos, ix. 9, is called in my text destruction, which word derived from *destruo*, signifies to unbuild, to decompose, or pull down. John ii. 19, Luke xxi. 6. It may be admitted—Hosea xiii. 9, Matt. xxi. 41, Mark xii. 9, Rom. ix. 22, 1 Thess. i. 9, and v. 3, 2 Thess. i. 9, and ii. 3, Philipp. i. 29, Heb. x. 39, and 2 Pet. iii. 7. For in all these places, the Jewish nation, as a collective body, appears to be the subject of destruction or dispersion. But hence we cannot infer the annihilation of their persons, for that God who threatened to sift them among all nations, promised that not a grain shall be lost, but all the seed of Israel shall be glorified. Amos ix. 9, Isa. xlv. 25. The God of eternal mercy promised to Israel, that though he make a full end of all nations, whether he has scattered them, yet will he not make a full end of them, but correct them in measure, and not leave them wholly unpunished. Jer. xxx. 11, and xlv. 29. How awfully this prophecy has been fulfilled, hear its accomplishment in the words of the Jews themselves. "Romans, Persians, Saracens, Christians, Mahometans, every nation and sect, have successively raised their arm against us; and from the Nile to the Vistula, from the Tagus to the Euphrates, every country has seen our blood flowing." Destruction, *olethron* in my text, is the Kolasis, punishment, Matt. xxv. 46, into which the unbelieving Jews went away. The aionian judgment, or as some MSS. have it,

Kolasis, of which they who blasphemed the holy spirit were in danger. Mark iii. 29. The blindness which has happened to them till the fulness of the Gentiles come. Rom. xi. 25. This Kolasis is produced by fear, or apprehension, 1 John iv. 18, and is the effect of unbelief. The severity of God's judgments on this unhappy people is set forth under the metaphor of a furnace of fire, Ex. xxii. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, Isa. xxxi. 9, Matt. xiii. 42, into which God predicted *he would gather them as men gather lead and tin, and melt them in the midst of his furnace, which was in Jerusalem*. This prophecy was verified at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the Roman general. Christ foretold, that dreadful period should be *a time of trouble such as there never was, nor ever should be hereafter*. Matt. xxiv. 21. Here permit me to remark, this text alone is sufficient to overthrow the Pagan doctrines of hell and endless misery. If there were not another in the bible opposed to these horrible dogmas, it would be imperative on all men, to deny its authenticity or abandon the terrific doctrine of eternal torture. "If, says Josephus, all the misfortunes of all nations from the beginning of the world were compared with those which befell the Jews, they would appear much less in comparison. The destruction of this people, exceeded all the destructions ever God or man brought on the world." He calculates 1,100,000 were destroyed in the siege, 237,000 who perished in other places, besides innumerable multitudes swept away by famine and pestilence, of which no calculation could be made. Above 2,000 laid violent hands on themselves. 97,000 were sold slaves. 11,000 were starved to death under one leader. A lady of rank was seen to murder and eat her own child. Manneus, a Jew, who fled to Titus, affirmed that from the beginning of the siege on the 14th of April, to the 1st of July, 115,880 dead bodies had been carried out through one gate, of which the keeping had been committed to him. Many respectable deserters assured Titus that not less than 600,000 poor, had been cast out at the different gates; and whilst he beheld the dead piled under the walls, raised his hands to heaven, and protested he had not been the cause of this deplorable calamity. Moreover, the Jews, who had been vanquished by the army of Vespasian, having fled to the ships, were pursued by a horrible tempest, which dashed their vessels against each other, and against the rocks, so that the raging billows were literally stained with blood, and 4,200 dead bodies were strewn along the shore.

On the 10th of August, A. D. 70, 1030 years from the foundation of the first temple by Solomon, and 639 after it had been rebuilt by Haggai; that fatal day on which it had formerly been destroyed by the king of Babylon, a Roman soldier, contrary to the command of Titus, urged as he declared by a divine impulse, threw a flaming brand into the golden window of the temple, which instantly set the building in flames. The Romans ranged the streets murdering all without distinction, till the dead bodies choked up the alleys, and the blood literally flowed in streams down the channels of the city.

On the 8th of Sept. A. D. 70, the siege terminated, leaving Jerusalem, the subject of a thousand prophecies, and once the praise of the earth, destroyed by the flame, bleeding on every side, and sunk in ruin and desolation. Sixty-four years after the destruction of that capital, the Jews rebelled against the Roman government under the administration of Adrian. He demolished 986 of their best towns, and slew 585,000 by the edge of the sword, besides countless numbers which perished by famine, sickness, and fire. Judea was depopulated, and an incredible number of its inhabitants sold like horses, and dispersed over the face of the earth. Surely these were the days of vengeance in which all things that were written were accomplished. Luke xxi. 22.

Some have wildly imagined that the fire in which Christ appeared was a sign of divine vengeance, and will be the very instrument of destruction. But surely if our bodies be changed, or raised incorruptible and immortal, such bodies shall be able to abide the fire as Christ. If then Christ endure no pain by appearing in fire, neither will we, nor can it torment us more than our Judge! Let such gross ideas be banished from all rational minds.

2. Another design or transaction of Christ's coming was to gather together his elect, or his saints, i. e. the Christians from the four winds of heaven, and cause them to come from the east and from the west; from the north and from the south, and sit down in the kingdom of God. Matt. viii. 11, and xxiv. 31. Our Lord encouraged the Christians, on seeing the signs that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, *to lift up their heads, for then the day of their redemption draws nigh, and the kingdom of God was at hand.* Luke xxi. 28, 31, Joel ii. 30. had foretold that whosoever should call on the name of the Lord should be saved from the calamities which should come on the unbelieving Jews. Accordingly, Eusebius' Hist. Eccl. L. 3, c. 5, and Epiphanius, Her. Naz. s. 7, inform us that at the beginning of the war the Christians were warned to escape to Pella beyond Jordan, in the country of Perca where they were preserved. Josephus remarks that when Gestiuss Gallus, President of Syria, had besieged Jerusalem, and taken the lower city, and might have taken the upper, and immediately put an end to the war, he suddenly quit the siege without any visible cause, and then many fled out of the city, as from a sinking ship. Bell. Jud. L. 2. c. 40. Christ forewarned his followers to flee to the mountains as soon as they would see Jerusalem encompassed with armies. They obeyed, and were, as Joel predicted, saved from destruction with a great deliverance. Matthew, Mark, and Paul, are peculiarly careful to connect the time of the gathering of the saints with that of the coming of the Son of Man. Matt. xxiv. 31, and xxv. 31. Mark xiii. 27. 2 Thess. ii. 1. These passages of scripture may be referred to Psal. l. 5. Gather my saints unto me. Zech. xiv. 5. The Lord shall come and all his saints. Bishop Newton justly observes, Diss. 20, on the Prophecies, "This is all in the style and phraseology of the prophets; but stripped of figure, only means that after the destruction of Jerusalem,

Christ by his angels, or ministers of the gospel, would collect a glorious church and people, having thrust out the Jews from the kingdom of God. Nothing ever tended so powerfully and directly to the establishment of Christianity as the dispersion of the Jewish nation and abolition of the temple service."

The greatest part of the converts to Christianity during the apostolic age, were Jews or proselytes to their religion, Acts xvii. 4. These being all zealous of the law, Acts xxi. 20, persevered in synagogue worship, in which also many of the Gentiles joined, especially those of Corinth, Galatia, Philippi, and Thessalonica. Thousands of these Judaizing Christians attended the grand festival at Jerusalem, beheld the signs of our Lord's coming and the confirmation of all their hopes by the manifestation of our Saviour's faithfulness and exalted majesty. Perceiving the design of God to abolish the temple and synagogue services, and set up a more pure, simple, and spiritual worship, they betook themselves to the more sacred services of the new and better covenant. Thus faith being established in Christ's Mission, they immediately formed churches and laid the foundation of that kingdom of God and heaven so frequently noticed by the sacred writers. Hence in that day of Christ's triumph over the rebellious Jews, who would not have him to reign over them; in that day of the establishment of Christianity, and gathering of the elect, Christ was glorified by the saints, and admired by all that believed. 2 Thess. i. 10.

This gathering together of the elect at the establishment of Christianity, is the *first resurrection*, and the *second death* or destruction of the apostolic Jews, had no power over the Christians who fell not away in the general apostacy. Rev. ii. 11. This was the time when the dead small and great stood before God, and were judged every one out of the books according to their works. Rev. xx. 11, 12. The coming of the Son of Man when every one was rewarded according to his works. Matt. xvi. 27. The time when the wicked as goats were sent away into aionian, correction;—and the righteous shone forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. Matt. xxv. 46, and xiii. 43.

This was the hour in which all that were in the graves heard the voice of the Son of God; and came forth, some to the resurrection of aionian or christian life; others to the resurrection of condemnation, or exclusion from the gospel privileges, because of unbelief. John v. 29. Heb. iv. 6. See also Dan. xii. 2, especially the end of the 7th verse. This was the day God had appointed to judge the world by the man whom he had ordained. Acts xvii. 31. I know of no other coming to judgment, no other general judgment according to works, nor no other general resurrection!!

How absurdly do predestinarians who believe God predetermined the fate of all men before the foundation of the world, almost the whole Christian world who believe man's destiny to be fixed at death, talk of a future general judgment. What! Does Jehovah not know the hearts of men, or does he

need to summon evidence! Will he compel his holy ones to leave their blissful abodes, and recall from tartarian cells the souls of the damned, to obtain a verdict in favour of the prisoners, or against the Judge who prematurely passed sentence on them? O rash mortals, accuse not your God of human folly, by supposing that he needs to reconsider his past conduct.

Christ plainly declares the Father judgeth no man. John v. 22. He as plainly asserts that he judges no man. John viii. 15, and xii. 47. Who then will hold this fanciful tribunal, before which the whole world must be convoked? Where shall they assemble, or what plain shall be large enough to afford a general view of the convocatory? Hear ye deaf, the words of Christ. John xii. 48. "*The word, [or doctrine] which I have spoken, the same shall judge him.*"

But, cries one, will not the judgment be after death? as Paul says, Heb. ix. 27. I answer, No. Paul says no such thing. His reasoning determines that Christ died only once as other men. But after this, the death of Christ, the judgment. Hark!—This judgment was an eternal and universal acquittal; for this judgment came upon all men to justification of life! Rom. v. 18. By one offering he perfected for ever them that were sanctified and obtained eternal redemption. Heb. ix. 12, and x. 14.

The whole fable of a judgment after death, arose from the Egyptian funeral ceremonies. The corps was conducted in a boat, over the lake Acherusia, and Charon the ferryman having produced the body on the opposite shore, the magistrate passed judgment on it, whether it should be buried or not. This ceremony administered sufficient data to the fertile genius of Orpheus, for the whole story about hell and the judgment after death. See Rollin's History, vol. 1, and Chateaubriand's travels. The Bible says nothing of a judgment after death, nor of Christ's coming to such a judgment. All is fancy, all tradition, all paganism! The evangelical judgment is during life. Every day we stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and receive in body according to that which we have done. 2 Corinthians v. 10.

We have seen in this discourse, that God recompensed tribulation to the persecuting Jews in this life; and to the troubled followers of Jesus, tranquility. What countless myriads of the former, became the sport of war, horror, and destruction! to the latter, the sun of righteousness arises with healing in his wings! Not one Christian perished in the deluge of blood and devastation; for he who knows to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust to the day of judgment, 2 Peter ii. 9, he said, not a hair of their heads should perish. Luke xxi. 13. Who can seriously reflect on these equitable arrangements of Providence, and not exclaim, Verily, there is a reward for the righteous; there is a God who judgeth in the earth! Ps. lxxviii. 11. The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner! Prov. xi. 31. Amen.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

In the "Connecticut Evangelical Magazine," edited by fifteen clergymen, we find the following: Page 298, "When Korah, Dathan, and Abiram impiously rebelled against the Lord, he caused the earth to open her mouth, and swallow them up, with their wives, sons, and little children. Thus, by destroying the *children* of these wicked men, as a token of his awful displeasure against their daring impiety, God visited upon them the iniquity of their fathers." Again, page 332—"The children of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were *sinner*s. They were also creatures, whose lives were at the divine disposal. God therefore had a *perfect right* to take their lives, as he pleased. He would have had a just right to cause the earth to open her mouth and swallow them up, though their fathers had been the best of men. He had the same right to take their lives in this way, as by sickness, burning of houses, or any other calamity. Therefore God did them no injustice, in thus destroying them on account of the daring wickedness of their parents, and as a token of his displeasure against it."

Now my Bible teaches me, that the children of Korah and his company, were not consumed with their fathers, for we read in Num. xxvi. 9, 10, 11. "This is that Dathan, and Abiram, which were famous in the congregation, who strove against Moses and against Aaron, in the company of Korah, when they strove against the Lord: and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up together with Korah, when that company died; what time the fire devoured two hundred and fifty *men*: and they became a sign. Notwithstanding, the *children* of Korah died not." Now, Mr. Editor, although there appears to be a contradiction between the Bible and the Editors of the Magazine, still I am unwilling, and almost unable, to believe that fifteen of the most learned and respectable clergymen in Connecticut, could either ignorantly or wilfully publish and disseminate error. May not the translation be erroneous, or may there not be some interpolation? Your remarks on the subject, if you think it worth your attention, would oblige me, and perhaps serve to enlighten my understanding. S. R. SIBLEY.

ANSWER.

We read in Num. xvi. 27-33, of the destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. It would appear that the *children* of Korah were also destroyed, by reading the 27th and 30th verses only; but, the 32d verse declares that all the *men* were swallowed up. This is proved to be the correct view of the passage by the correction, or exposition of the writer of the book; who informs us, in the 26th chapter, that "the *children* of Korah died not."

It appears the fifteen *learned* clergymen are ignorant of some things. They ought to read the Bible more attentively, and not mislead the public by wrong statements.

MOTIVES TO MINISTERS.

An old divine, preaching before an association of ministers, and desiring to quicken them in regard to the principal end and motives from which they

acted, pointed them to the last and awful day of judgment; and having considered Christ the Judge, as seated on the throne, he represented him as calling his ministers to an account; inquiring how they had preached, and with what views.

He calls one first, and puts this question to him: "What did you preach for?" He answers, "I preached, Lord, that I might keep a good living left me by my father; and which would have been lost to the family if I had not taken orders." Christ says to him, "*Stand by; thou hast had thy reward.*"

The question is put to another: "And what did you preach for?" He replies, "Lord, I was applauded as a very learned man; and I preached to keep up the reputation of an eloquent orator, and an ingenious preacher." Christ's answer to him also was "*Stand by; thou hast had thy reward.*"

The Judge puts the question to a third: "And what did you preach for?" "Lord, (said he,) I neither aimed at the great things of this world, though I was thankful for the conveniencies of life, which thou gavest me; nor did I preach to acquire the character of a wit or a scholar, but I preached in compassion to *souls*, and to please and honour *thee*. My design in preaching, Lord, was to win souls to thy blessed Majesty!" Upon this, the Judge called out, "Room, men, room! Angels, let this man come and sit down with me, on my throne; he has owned and honoured me upon earth, and I will own and honour him through eternity!"

The result of this representation was, that all the clergymen went home much affected; resolving, that through the help of God, they would mind their work *more*, and look *better* to their *aims* and *ends* ever after. *Plain Truth.*

LAVATER'S PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

Extract from his private diary of a self-observer, January 2, 1769.

"Awoke at six o'clock—remembered that I am mortal; gave thanks to God; and read the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of St. Matthew. What a treasure of pure morality! I now went to my avocations, and continued them till noon. My wife asked me during dinner what sentiment I had chosen for the day? "Give to him that asketh; and from him that would borrow turn not thou away." "Pray, how is this to be understood?" said she. "Literally. We must take the words as if we heard Jesus Christ himself pronounce them. I am the steward, not the proprietor of my possessions."

Just as I arose from dinner, a widow desired to speak with me. "You will excuse me, dear sir," said she, "I must pay my rent, and I am six dollars short. I have been ill a whole month, and could scarcely keep my poor children from starving. I have laid by every penny—but I am six dollars short, and must have them to-day or to-morrow—pray hear me, dear sir." Here she presented me a book encased with silver. "My late husband," said she, "gave it to me when we were betrothed. I part with it with reluctance, and know not when I can redeem it. O, dear sir, cannot you assist me?" "My good woman, indeed I cannot." So saying, I

put my hand into my pocket, and touched my money; it was about two dollars and a half. "It won't do," said I to myself, and if it would, I shall want it. "Have you no friend, (said I,) who would give you such a trifle?" "No, not a soul living; and I do not like to go from house to house; I would rather work whole nights. I have been told that you are a good-natured gentleman; and if you cannot assist me, you will, I hope, excuse me, for having given you so much trouble. I will try how I can extricate myself; God has never forsaken me, and I hope he will not begin to turn his back on me in my 76th year." The same moment my wife entered the room.

I was—O thou traitorous heart!—I was angry, ashamed, and should have been glad if I could have sent her away under some pretext or other, for my conscience whispered to me, "Give to him who asketh thee." My wife too, whispered irresistibly in my ear, "she is a pious, honest woman; she has certainly been ill; assist her if you can." "I have no more than two dollars by me," answered I, in a whisper, "and she wants six; how, therefore, can I answer her demand; I will give something and send her away." My wife squeezed my hand tenderly; smiling and beseeching me by her looks. She then said aloud, what my conscience had whispered to me before; "Give to him that asketh thee, and do not turn away from him who would borrow of thee." I smiled, and asked her whether she would give her ring, in order to enable me to do it? "With great pleasure," said she, pulling off her ring. The good old woman was either too simple to observe this, or too modest to take advantage of it. However, when she was going, my wife told her to wait a little in the passage: "Were you in earnest, my dear, when you offered your ring?" said I, as soon as we were in private. "I am surprised that you can ask that question; do you think I sport with charity? Remember what you said an hour ago. You have always been so benevolent; and why are you now backward in assisting that poor woman? Why did you not give her what money you had to spare? Do you not know that there are six dollars in your bureau, and that it will be quarter day in ten days?" I pressed my wife to my bosom and dropped a tear. "You are more righteous than I! Keep your ring; you have made me blush! I then went to the bureau and took the six dollars. When I was going to open the door to call the widow, I was seized with horror, because I had said, "I cannot help you." O thou traitorous tongue! thou deceitful heart! "There, take the money," said I, "which you want." She seemed at first to suppose it was only a small contribution, and kissed my hand. But when she saw the six dollars, her astonishment was so great, that for a moment she could not speak. She then said, "How shall I thank you? I cannot repay you; I have got nothing but this poor book, and it is old." "Keep your book and money, (said I,) and thank God, and not me. Indeed I do not deserve it, because I have hesitated so long to assist you. Go, in the name of God, and say not one word more."

RELIGIOUS EXPENDITURES.

"The labourer is worthy of his hire." Luke x. 7.

We are fully of opinion that a knowledge of the amount of the exorbitant sums raised and expended annually in this country for religious purposes, would produce an inquiry into the advantages which are supposed to result from these disbursements. In addition to this, the consideration that a portion of every community are widows and fatherless children, or persons whom circumstances have made necessitous, and objects of rational charity, who are justly entitled to the regard and attention of their fellows, make it evident, that the means so lavishly expended might be used for a *certain* good, and to produce results the most gratifying to the best feelings of humanity.

The greatest foible of the present day, is a desire of *show, parade, and pre-eminence*. Even the avowed meek and humble servant of Christ, who on the Sabbath preaches the *vanity* of this world, its possessions and enjoyments, and exhorts all to soberness and moderation, with all the etceteras of christian abstinence, appears, on Monday, a man of the despised world, living in all the contemned pride and luxury of modern folly. His *superfluous* expenses would maintain a dozen *widows*, or supply the wants of as many *orphans*, whom an unfeeling world pass by unheeded. How many lay, as it were, at the gate of his splendid house, and would receive the "crumbs that fall from his table!"

Modern *rich* men must die; and if they, according to the orthodox and literal understanding of Christ's declaration, "should lift up their eyes in *Hell*, being in *torment*," and see the despised poor in Abraham's bosom, they would *feel* what they now talk so much about, that the things of this world are *vanity*. Yea, and it would vex their spirits too, were they to be made sharers of the torments they so liberally denounce on others.

"*Physician heal thyself.*" This is an old saying. Spiritual physicians are endeavouring to heal their congregations of pride, luxury, and uncharitableness. Let them try their skill on themselves. *Vie* with their hearers in *plainness, frugality, and prudence*; and not ape the rich, and strain every nerve to shine in all the splendour of pride and profusion.

"The labourer is worthy of his hire," and no more. The surplus sums that are expended in fashionable follies, belong to the necessitous. It would be a glorious era in the annals of Christendom, if all would rise as one man, and afford the clergy of the present day an opportunity of verifying the truth of their declarations, that they are willing to be devoted to the cause of God and religion. Remove the present stimulant, the *exorbitant salaries*, and test the pretensions of those who are nursed in the lap of pride, luxury, and indolence.

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION.

"The greatest of these is charity." 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

The good opinion of the world is courted, and the censure of the world dreaded by many whose pretensions argue altogether a different rule of conduct.

Pride is at the bottom. "What will the *people* say?" The principle, or thing itself, is not so much considered as the opinion which mankind have of it. It is to be feared that very few "overcome the world" in any considerable degree, according to the true sense of the term. The world is uppermost. So potent is this pride, this love of the world, that, when no other alternative is presented but to sacrifice a friend, the truth, or the world, "*faith and hope*" are forgotten, and pride is all-prevailing. We do believe that *charity*, (or love,) such as proceeds from above, is sufficient to overcome the world. We also believe, that the world overcomes every thing else. The man who first considers how the world will view any thing that is presented to him, instead of considering his duty, and how God will view it, may have made great advances in religious society, in popularity, and in the world's applause, but he has not yet learned the first letter in the alphabet of Christ.

EXTRACT FROM PRICE'S SERMONS.

How shocking will be our fate should any of us after all remain unsaved; and find that Christ lived and died in vain, as to any benefit we shall derive from him? I am sensible that there are some very wise and good Christians who think this cannot be the case ultimately with any human being; and that even the impenitent will (after a severity of future punishment proportioned to the different degrees of guilt) be recovered to virtue and happiness; and thus Christ's triumph over sin and death become at last universal and complete. This is an opinion which the feelings of every benevolent man would determine him eagerly to embrace, could it be shown to be consistent with the language of scripture; and I dare not pronounce that it is not so. But God forbid, that any of us should risk upon it the *existence* of our immortal souls; or suffer such an expectation to render us less fearful of the consequences of vice.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

QUERIES, RESPECTING THE DEVIL.

The clergy, who believe, and teach others to believe, that there is an immortal, spiritual being, who was once a holy angel in heaven, and who by transgression and rebellion against God, fell from his moral rectitude, for which he was cast out of heaven down to a place which they call hell, there to be confined and tormented, in a lake of fire and brimstone to all eternity; and who tempted Eve in the garden of Eden, in the form of a serpent, and who now tempts every man and woman in the whole world, to all the sin which is committed, and who intends thereby to provoke God, who sent him to hell, to send us there too; which being, the clergy call the Devil, are humbly called upon to give us, in short, all the information on this subject in their possession, which they may think will not endanger their craft to disclose. As a good reason for calling for this information, may be stated the fact, that there are many people, who not only disbelieve this doctrine, on which the clergy wholly depend for

their standing in this world, but who go so far as to treat it with no small disrespect. Should this dangerous heresy, of denying this fundamental doctrine of the devil, generally prevail, even a novice, with half an eye can see the whole foundation of the popular hierarchy at once swept away.

As some are so vainly curious as to ask, how it happened that sin should originate in heaven, and how it was possible for the devil, who was confined in hell, to have the opportunity of dressing himself up in a serpent and visiting Eve in Eden, and how it is that he being in hell confined, can be present with every man, woman, and child in the whole world, it might be well to stop the mouths of these querists by plain and direct answers to their questions.

—◆—
From the Rochester Magazine.
NEW SOCIETY.

On Wednesday, Feb. 18, a number of persons, believing in the doctrine of Universal Salvation, met according to the public notice, at their usual place of worship in Carroll-street, and formed themselves into a society, according to the law of the state. Having appointed Br. John S. Thompson, chairman, and Henry S. Hanna, clerk, to preside in the meeting, they proceeded to elect their officers, and pass the following resolutions:

1. This society shall be denominated **THE FIRST UNIVERSALIST SOCIETY** of Rochester, Monroe county, New-York.

2. The following **CREED** shall form the religious constitution of the society:

We believe in one eternal, unchangeable, and infinitely wise, good and powerful Lord God; who is the **SOLE** creator, proprietor and governor of the universe, the **COMMON FATHER** AND **IMPARTIAL** **BENEFACTOR** OF ALL MANKIND.

We believe Jehovah, who spoke in time past by the Jewish Prophets, hath spoken to us by his son Jesus Christ; whom he hath appointed **HEIR** OF **ALL THINGS**; and by whom, as *the Mediator*, he will bring *all his intelligent offspring* to eternal purity and happiness.

We believe virtue and happiness, vice and misery, are inseparably connected, as cause and effect; and consequently in order to be happy, men must *do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God.*

3. All applicants, who maintain a good moral character, and are willing to sign the constitution, by giving their names to the clerk, shall be eligible to membership, at any subsequent meeting of the society.

—◆—
A GOOD HINT TO A CATHOLIC.

A Protestant, who reaped a small farm from Alexander, duke of Gordon, having fallen behind in his payments, a vigilant steward, in his grace's absence, seized the farmer's stock, and advertised it to be sold by auction on a fixed day. The duke happily returned home in the interval, and the tenant went to him to supplicate for indulgence. "What is the matter, Donald?" said the duke, as he saw him en-

ter with sad downcast looks. Donald told his sorrowful tale in a concise natural manner: It touched the duke's heart, and produced a formal acquittance of the debt. Donald, as he cheerfully withdrew, was staring at the pictures and images he saw in the ducal hall, and expressed to the duke, in a homely way, a wish to know what they were. "These," (said the duke, who was a Roman Catholic,) are the saints who intercede with God for me." "My Duke," (said Donald,) would it not be better to apply yourself directly to God? I went to muckle Sawney Gordon, and to little Sawney Gordon; but if I had not come, to your grace's self, I could not have got my discharge, and both I and my bairns had been harried." (*i. e.* turned out from house and home.)

Rel. Intel.

—◆—
INEFFICACY OF FORMAL PRAYER.

In one of the assemblies in America, during her war with Great Britain, wherein there was a majority of Presbyterians, a law was proposed to forbid the praying for the King by the Episcopalians, who however, could not conveniently omit that prayer, it being prescribed in their Liturgy. Dr. Franklin, one of the members, seeing that such a law would occasion more disturbance than it was worth, said that he thought it quite *unnecessary*, for, added he, "those people have, to my certain knowledge, been praying constantly these twenty years past, that *God would give the King and his council wisdom*, and we all know that not the least notice has ever been taken of that prayer; so that it is plain they have no interest in the court of heaven." The house smiled, and the motion was dropt.

Franklin's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 699.



—◆—
NEW PUBLICATION.

We have received the first Number of the "**MESSENGER OF PEACE**," edited by our Br. Richard Carrique, (formerly editor of the Hartford "**Religious Inquirer**,") and published in Hudson, semi-monthly, at one dollar per annum. Subscriptions to the above received at this office.

—◆—
PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT.

"**The Second Death**"—Rev. xx. 14.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on **TUESDAY** Evening next, at seven o'clock.

—◆—
LINES

Said to be written by an Idiot.

With ink was the whole ocean fill'd,
Was the whole earth of parchment made,
Was every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade;

To write the love of God alone
Would drain the ocean dry,
The scrawl would not contain the whole
Though stretch'd from sky to sky.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS
PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL
HERALD, NO. 67 CHRISTIE-STREET.
Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1824.

NO. 49.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—Mr. Thomas Belsham, of London, has lately published, in four vols. 8vo. "The Epistles of Paul the apostle, translated with an Exposition and notes." Mr. Belsham ranked for many years among the followers of John Calvin; he succeeded Dr. Doddridge as Professor of Divinity in the Calvinistic college at Daventry. Happily for himself, and for the cause of Christian truth, he got rid of the horrid system of Calvin, and has for several years been an able and successful advocate of Unitarian Universalism.

Since his change in sentiment, he has been much engaged in controversy. His principal works are—"Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind—Summary View of the Evidence of Christianity—Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the person of Christ—Memoirs of Lindsey," &c. The following are his remarks on the present work.—"It is after mature consideration that the author has adopted that theory of interpretation of the Epistles of Paul, which was first suggested by Mr. Locke, and afterwards amplified, confirmed, and illustrated by the late learned Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, in his celebrated Key to the Apostolic writings, prefixed to his Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans. The general principle of which theory is, that the children of Israel who had been formerly the chosen people of God, having been cast off by him, because of their great wickedness, and particularly for their rejection of the Messiah, believers in Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, are now admitted into the same relation to the Deity which the Israelites once held; and those terms which were formerly applied to the state and privileges of the Israelites, are now used to express the state and privileges of Christian believers. For example—The Israelites having been selected by God from all other nations, to be his peculiar people, are for that reason said to be *chosen* or *elect*. Being placed in a new state of moral existence, they are said to be *created*. Being separated from the rest of mankind for the service and worship of the true God, they are *consecrated* or holy. Having formerly been heathen idolaters, they were then aliens and enemies; being become worshippers of the true God, they are *reconciled* and friends. Having been promised an inheritance in Canaan, they are made *sons* and children of God. Having been recovered from the bondage of Egypt, they are *redeemed*, delivered, purchased. Having been put into possession of Canaan, and favoured with a divine institute, they are the servants and *subjects* of

God, in covenant with him, and bound by their allegiance to him.

"On the other hand, God is represented as sustaining the correspondent relations of a Creator, Redeemer, Saviour, Father, Sovereign, Judge, a reconciled God, and a God in covenant. He requires homage, worship, love, confidence, unlimited obedience to his laws and statutes, and, above all things, that they should abstain from idolatry. And upon these *conditions*, he promises to be their protector and friend, to defend them from their enemies, and to continue them in possession of the land of Canaan, and of all the privileges and blessings they enjoy. But, on the contrary, if they violate the covenant, if they disobey the law, if they reject his authority, if they swerve into idolatry, he also threatens to disown them as his people, to cast them out of covenant, to visit them with judgments, to expel them from the land of Canaan and to deliver them over to their enemies. Now this language applied not so much to the *moral* conduct, and to the personal character of the Israelites, as to their eternal state, as a community separated by a peculiar ritual from the rest of the world, consecrated to the service of God, and the main design of which was, to support in the world a standing memorial and testimony against idolatry. But the apostle teaches, that the Jews having rejected Jesus as the messiah, are therefore themselves as a community rejected by God, they are no longer a holy and peculiar people; they are cast out of covenant; and in a rational view, they stand upon the same footing as the Gentile world.

"He farther teaches, that Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified and who rose again, is the true Messiah promised by the prophets, the mediator of a new and better covenant. That Jews and Gentiles are alike invited to enter into its engagements, and to accept its blessings; and that all who believe in Jesus as the Messiah, and who enter themselves as members of that community of which he is the head, are introduced into the same state of grace and privilege in which Israel formerly stood, and are entitled to the same honourable distinctions. Believers in Christ are acknowledged as the spiritual Israel, the true people of God, his servants, his children; they are chosen, holy, redeemed, called and saved; having once been enemies, they are now reconciled, they are new created, new born; God is their Creator, their Redeemer, their Governor, their Father; they are translated out of darkness into light, and from the kingdom of Satan, a state of *idolatry*, into that of God's dear Son, the Christian community, they become fellow citizens with the

saints, heirs of the promise, and of the household of God. All these high and honourable titles are applied to them in consequence of their having become members of the Christian community, and do not generally express *moral character*, so much as an *eternal state*; a state of privilege and profession, which if they duly improve, they shall obtain the promised blessings; they shall at the appointed season be raised from the grave to a new and endless life; and when Christ who is their life shall appear, they also shall appear with him in glory.

"He who reads the Epistles of Paul with attention, will plainly see that this is the general meaning of his language; without this clue it will be almost impossible to understand his admirable writings; with it, there are few passages which do not admit a simple and easy interpretation; or, to say the least, the judicious application of this principle elucidates many passages which would otherwise be involved in inextricable difficulty."

Such are the views of Mr. Belsham, after years of patient and intense study of the writings of the great apostle to the Gentiles. Of late years we have had several excellent translations of the New Testament, by the editors of the improved version, Scarlet, Wakefield, Kneeland, &c. I think it would be very desirable to have a correct version of the Old, leaving out that worthless production called the Song of Solomon, which as far as I can judge, does not contain either moral or religious instruction. Professor Wellbeloved, of the Unitarian college, York, began publishing a version of the Old and New Testaments, on the basis of the public version. It was to be comprised in 12 parts 4to. price 10s. 6d. each. How far he has proceeded with the work I know not, but considering the talents of Mr. Wellbeloved, and his freedom from the shackles of creeds, much light may be expected from his translation and exposition.

Yours, &c.

J. L.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD. SENECA MISSION.

The unfortunate schisms which have prevailed among the Seneca Indians relative to the Christian Missionary Establishment upon the Buffalo reservation, has finally resulted in the removal of the Rev. Mr. Harris, by the order of Judge Camp, which order was made in pursuance of the statute of 1821, to prohibit the residence of white people upon Indian lands.

In 1822, a bill was introduced into the senate of this state, providing for the residence of school teachers, and ministers of the gospel, among the Indians, which that body refused to sanction, by a very large majority.

Strange notions are entertained, and no doubt unfounded representations have gone abroad, relative to the improvement of the nations, and to their views of our holy religion. I confess there is the appearance of barbarism, in refusing an inoffensive preacher of the gospel a residence among the heathen of our land; the fault, however, is in the makers of the law, and cannot be imputed to those

whose duty it is to see it faithfully and impartially executed. How far the Indians have been benefited by the influence and labours of missionary societies, I do not pretend to say. But if experience is worth any thing, if we are warranted in drawing a single inference as to what *will* take place, from what *has* transpired since the days of the apostles; if from the same facts the same results are to be expected, and if from similar causes we are to look for similar effects, the conclusion is irresistible, that agriculture and mechanical industry will walk hand in hand with civilization; and that they, together with national independence, constitute the grand pillars of moral and intellectual improvement.

The North American savages are totally dependent, and those situated in the neighbourhood of white people are constantly diminishing in numbers. Many of the most powerful tribes have become extinct. The remaining ones have imbibed most of our *vices*, with few of our *virtues*, and all have uniformly retreated before the advance of civilization. With a few solitary exceptions, their enterprise is limited to their immediate wants. With these people wealth has no charms, and if any thing like ambition has been discovered among them, it is in the anxiety which they disclose to preserve their name, habits and character, as a separate people. Let the Indians be incorporated into civilized society, let there be extended to them all the rights and privileges of citizenship, and it would no doubt open a field of enterprise, in which the talents of individuals would be properly estimated, and in which intelligence, wealth and industry, would soon dissipate the charms of a savage life. But the distinctions which always have been, and no doubt always will be, recognized between the crippled and degraded descendants of the ancient lords of the soil, and the children of their conquerors, render it impossible to arrest the decline of the former, who even at this time may well be said to be upon the very confines of political annihilation. Their natural spirit is broken, and even the name of *warrior*, which formerly seemed to concentrate all the pride and affections of the North American barbarians, has lost its influence among every tribe or nation which is located within the limits, or even knowledge of civilization. Politically, they look for nothing above the level of unconditional submission. Under these circumstances, no man can rationally look for religious improvement, or moral reformation.

The mysteries of our religion they are incapable of understanding, and it is but a few days since the celebrated Red Jacket gave a striking illustration of this truth, in speaking of what our ministers had related of the crucifixion of our Saviour. He said, "I have reflected a great deal upon the subject, for a great many years, and thus far have not been able to see how the Indians had any thing to do in that transaction, or how they can be effected by it. The *Great Spirit* which the Indians worship, cannot be killed, and I cannot see how the Great Spirit (or God) of the white people, could have been hung upon a tree."

Here then is proof conclusive, that this great man, who has for more than forty years been the most distinguished of all the unlettered sons of the forest, for the acute discrimination and brilliancy of his reasoning powers, is not only ignorant of the doctrine of salvation through the merits of the Redeemer, but is totally incapable of comprehending it. The converted among the heathen, if such can be found, know as little of the Gospel as they do of the Alcoran. Whatever is explained to them, is almost universally through the medium of interpreters who can neither read nor write.

That some of them profess to be believers, is no doubt true, and it is equally true, that the same would as readily believe the fabrications of Munchausen, from the mouths of their teachers, as they would the doctrines of Paul. They are not sufficiently enlightened to have any just conceptions of the Divinity. For the last twenty years, the people of this section of the state, have seen all the benefits, if any, resulting from the different missionary establishments among the tribes composing, what is usually termed, the Six Nations. So far as my experience extends, heart burnings and jealousies, have been introduced among them, by an officious intermeddling with a religion which has been riveted upon their minds by the influence of intellectual darkness and degradation. The religion of these people is better suited to their condition than what is generally supposed; and I believe no part of their creed embraces a principle more absurd than the doctrine of endless damnation, or the declared will of God from all eternity, to save one portion of his creatures, and to destroy another. CONSISTENCY.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Newark, August 25th, 1823.

DEAR NEPHEW,

You will recollect that you sometime ago called at our house, and you and I had some conversation respecting the doctrine of Universal Salvation, when I told you, that I could never be brought to believe in that doctrine, until I believed that the Scriptures were not true; but I was not then prepared to point out but few of the particular passages of scripture which I then conceived, and still conceive, must be false, if your favourite doctrine is true. I have since that time selected a number, out of a far greater number of scriptures, which I think altogether disproves the doctrine in question. I have confined my selection to the New Testament; a catalogue of which I now think proper to send you, and I wish you to turn to them in your Bible, and carefully read them over and over again, and if you are not then convinced, I shall conclude that you would not be convinced if one should rise and go to you from the dead. The catalogue follows:

Matt. v. 20, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30. vi. 15. vii. 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, and 27. viii. 11 and 12. x. 33. xii. 31, 32, &c. xiii. 33 to 43, and 47 to 52. xvi. 26, &c. xviii. 3, &c. xix. 16, &c. xx. 16. xxii. 1 to 14. xxiii. 33. xxiv. 24, &c. xx. 10, &c. 46.—Mark viii. 34 to 38. ix. 43 to 48. x. 15. xiv. 21. xvi. 16.—Luke xiii. 23 to 28. xvi. 19 to 31. xviii.

17 to 27. John iii. 3, and 36. v. 23, 29. viii. 21, 24. ix. 4. xvi. 12.—Acts xv. first 29 verses.—Rom. ii. first 12 verses.—1 Cor. i. 18. vi. 9, 10.—2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. iv. 3, 4. v. 10, 11. xi. 13, 14, 15.—Gal. i. 8, 9. v. 21.—Ephes. v. 5, 6.—2 Thess. i. 5 to 9. ii. first 12 verses.—Heb. xii. 14, 25.—2 Peter 2d and 3d chapters throughout.—1 John v. 16, 17.—Jude 5, 6, 7, 13.—Rev. xiv. 10, 11. xvi. 9, 10, 11. xx. 12 to 15. xxii. 17, 18, and 19.

Now, my dear Nephew, you have my selections before you, and I wish you to turn to them one after another, as they are placed in rotation, and read them carefully with a spirit of prayer; and I pray God that both you and I may be enlightened so that we may understand and believe his word and practise accordingly. I shall make a few remarks on some of the texts which I have selected. You will notice, that a large proportion of them are from either Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John; which all, with I believe a single exception, recorded by them as the express words of their Master, who is by way of eminence, with great propriety, styled "The true and faithful Witness," therefore, we must place implicit confidence in what he hath said. Well, what hath he said? Why, he has said, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven." Now, if Christ did not intend by those words to declare, that such as have not a *better* righteousness than the scribes and Pharisees shall *never* enter into the kingdom of Heaven, pray tell me what he did intend, for his words must have a meaning?

I shall now pass on to what our blessed Saviour said, respecting the *wide* gate and *broad* way, and the *strait* gate and *narrow* way. You will find his words Matt. vii. 13, 14. But if your doctrine is true, his words in this passage cannot be correct. No! if *all men* will finally be saved, he ought to have said, and undoubtedly would have said, something to the following effect—"Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, which leadeth unto everlasting life, and *all* the sons and daughters of Adam shall finally go in thereat;" and he would never have uttered the words which respect the gate and the way which leadeth to *destruction*; for, if all go to Heaven, I conceive there can be no gate nor any way leading to *destruction*. Perhaps you will say, there is a place of destruction, but it is not *endless*. To answer this, I will remind you, that in several other texts, which will of course fall under your notice, *Hell* is described by the Faithful and true Witness, as a place of *everlasting burning*. A place, where their *worm dieth not*; and a fire that *never shall be quenched*. And, furthermore, this same true and Faithful Witness, who is also the Judge, says, that the "*wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment*"; and I cannot conceive of any terms that he could have used more forcibly to express the *endless* duration of their punishment, than what he has used, viz. "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (*Concluded in our next.*)

REMARKS.

The above letter was written by an old gentle-

man to his nephew, (both residing in the state of New-Jersey,) dissuading him from believing in the salvation of God for a lost world. It is now published at the request of the parties. The uncle is a Calvinist. He very properly remarked, in conversation with his nephew, that his quotations were too numerous to expect an examination of them in this paper; but he wishes some reply to his objections. This shall be done. We shall also accommodate this gentleman with a brief abstract of his creed, and a very *few* quotations for his consideration; having done this, we are very much mistaken if his mind is not more engaged in extricating his *own* system from difficulty, than in attempts to confound the opinions of *others*.

This Calvinistic gentleman, whom we shall call Mr. M., says of Christ, that "he is styled 'the true and faithful witness,' therefore we must place implicit confidence in what he hath said." He then interrogates—"What hath he said? Why, he hath said, 'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in *no case* enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" He, therefore, concludes, that they shall *never* enter into the kingdom of heaven. Mr. M. will please to remember, that Paul, at the time this declaration was made, was a Pharisee; and known as Saul of Tarsus. Therefore, Saul's righteousness, according to Mr. M.'s conclusion, was the seal of his *endless* ruin. But Saul entered into the kingdom of heaven, when his righteousness (or *mercy*) increased. The Pharisees justified themselves, and condemned others. No man will enter the kingdom with this disposition. See Heb. viii. 8-12.

Mr. M. next introduces Matt. vii. 13, 14, and argues, that if *all* shall finally be saved, Christ ought to have said, *Broad* is the way that leadeth unto everlasting life, and *all*, &c. shall go in, &c. We ask Mr. M. to remember, that "*Christ is the way*, the truth, and the life." He, and he alone, leads unto life. There are comparatively *few* that find him, while *many* find the broad way of Calvin, Hopkins, and Arminius. Christ speaks in the *present* tense. He does not say, of the "strait gate," that the largest portion of mankind shall for ever be excluded from it. He asserts a truth; namely, "*few* there be that find it." Mankind cannot find it, because they are blind. But the blind eyes shall be opened. (See Isa. xlii. 5-16. xxv. 6-8. xxviii. 14-18.) If Mr. M. will admit that Christ is the "strait gate," and believe Paul's testimony, (Eph. i. 9, 10,) he will find no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion, that all men will be brought to the "strait gate," and made the recipients of God's boundless mercy.

Mr. M. considers the destruction spoken of, to be *hell*, and also to be *endless*. He declares, "hell is described by the faithful and true Witness, as a place of *everlasting burning*. A place where their *worm dieth not*; and as a fire that *never shall be quenched*." We regret that Mr. M. does not name the chapter and verse, where the faithful witness makes these declarations. This, however, he cannot do. We inform Mr. M. that if he makes hell

a *place*, it is a valley contiguous to Jerusalem. If a *state*, it is darkness of the mind. But, whether a state or place, it must be confined to this life. The words '*never shall be*,' coupled with '*quenched*,' are found in the English New Testament, Mark ix. 44, 45; but they are nowhere to be found in the original Greek. The public is indebted to the translators of the book, for this alteration and amendment of the declaration of Christ. Therefore, we ask Mr. M., when he speaks of the "*faithful and true witness*," whether he means Christ, or the translators? It therefore appears that Mr. M. is altogether mistaken, and is himself the subject of gross deception.

That mankind are destroyed in a qualified and proper sense, the Scriptures abundantly testify. Psal. xc. 3. "Thou turnest man to destruction; and sayest, Return [from destruction] ye children of men." David says, Psal. lxxxvi. 13. "Great is thy mercy toward me; and thou hast delivered my soul from the *lowest hell*." In Psal. ciii. 4, the prophet blesses God, "who redeemeth thy life from destruction." Destruction is a blessing; for we read, Ezek. xxv. 7. "I will *destroy thee*, and thou shalt *know* that I am the Lord." Christ says, it is life to know God, &c. Hosea xiii. 9, we read, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me *is* thy help." It appears God will help those that are destroyed. He will say, "Return, ye children of men." And we are assured his word shall not return unto him void. (Isa. lv.)

Mr. M. also declares, of the "true Witness, who is also the Judge, that he says, 'the *wicked* shall go away into *everlasting punishment*.'" Christ does not say the *wicked* shall go away, &c. but the *goats*, &c. (We should be pleased to see the words of the "true Witness" in preference to any substitute.) Neither does Christ say they shall "go away into *everlasting punishment*." The original words, *kolasin aionion*, signify something quite different from the acceptation of the English words *everlasting punishment*. Namely, *age-lasting correction*; or, the *correction of the age*. As the Jews are spoken of, under the figure of goats, and the nation separated, it is well known what the correction is, and that it is endured in this mode of being. (See Rom. xi.) Mr. M. says, "I cannot conceive of any terms that he could have used more forcibly to express the *endless* duration of the punishment, than what he has used." Admit this. Does it follow that your conception is to be the only criterion? Are you qualified to decide? It appears the apostles of Christ could conceive of terms which, in their estimation, would "more forcibly express an *endless* duration," and therefore used them! For an example, take Heb. vii. 16. We inform Mr. M. that when he *prunes* (corrects) his fruit trees, to make them bear *good fruit*, he *punishes* them, to all intents and purposes, (the end being considered,) as God punishes mankind.

We shall conclude the letter and our remarks, in our next Number; and agreeably to our promise, show a little Calvinism, for the accommodation of our correspondent. (Concluded in our next.)

From the (Bost.) Universalist Magazine.

REMARKS ON COL. II. 6.

"As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him."

How is Jesus Christ the Lord received by the true disciple? He is received, according to the apostle's words, 1 Cor. i. 30, "Wisdom, and righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." Christ, in the character of wisdom, unfolds the mysteries and treasures of divine truth. He teaches the true doctrine of God, unmixed with the inventions and traditions of men. With Christ before his eyes, the true disciple is enabled to determine the truth, or falsity of any tenet which is proposed for his solution. He brings it immediately into the light of divine wisdom. This is Christ, the light of the world. This wisdom is thus described by St. James; "But the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." *First pure*: It is clear and simple, unclouded with perplexing contradictions. Inconsistency can never be incorporated with the system of divine truth. If the proposed tenet, therefore, embraces contradictions, or if it consists of parts which are dissonant to each other, it is at once rejected as false. *Gentle, and easy to be entreated*: If the proposed tenet represents the Divine Being as unwilling to grant favours which are needed; or if such favours are supposed to be granted only on the most difficult terms, requiring immense sacrifices or equivalents for them, it is at once seen that all this is foreign from the true character of the gentle wisdom of God, and is rejected as a production of that wisdom which is from beneath. *Full of mercy*: If the proposed doctrine embrace notions, which represent our Father in heaven as unmerciful towards any of his offspring, it is known not to belong to Christ, who is full of mercy. *And good fruits*:—Any doctrine, whose natural tendency in the mind leads to anger, wrath, unkindness, pride, selfishness, contention; or to say to a brother, Stand by thyself, come not nigh me, I am holier than thou, cannot endure the light of that wisdom which is from above, which is full of good fruits. *Without partiality*: Any notions of the Supreme Ruler, which supposes him capable of being partial, of having his eternal purposes more favourable towards some of the human family, than towards others; or which maintains that he, of his own sovereign will, is disposed to do better by some than by others, are as easily detected as spurious and false, as the full grown tares are distinguished from the wheat. *And without hypocrisy*: The notions of men, which represent the Father of mercies as using the hypocrisy of making free offers of grace, mercy, and peace to sinners, when he has determined, from all eternity, never to grant them his favour on any conditions, or in any way possible, are at once discarded as false, and as being as unsound as they are hypocritical.

In this way, the disciple of Christ can, with the greatest ease and facility determine all manner of doctrinal questions. And while schoolmen and

doctors of divinity are spending years in their deep and learned researches to find some possible way, in which they can put darkness for light and light for darkness, sweet for bitter and bitter for sweet, and to make themselves and the world believe that they have arranged things in due order and placed them all right; and while these creed-makers and system-framers are perplexing themselves and one another, with all sorts of contradictions and inexplicable mysteries, the true disciple walks safely in the pure light of heavenly wisdom. He believes no doctrine but that which is pure, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

The true disciple not only receives Christ Jesus the Lord, as his wisdom to instruct him and guide him as to doctrine, but he also receives him as his *righteousness*. He receives him as a perfect example to imitate. This righteousness does not consist in observing certain days, as holy time; nor in performing a round of outward ceremonies; but in doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God. True devotion is not confined to a certain place or places, as to Jerusalem, or the mountain of Samaria, but it realizes that God is a spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

Sanctification and a complete redemption are obtained by this wisdom and righteousness. And as the disciple receives Christ Jesus the Lord in these characters, so he will walk in him.

REMARKS ON ROMANS ix. 3.

For I could wish that myself were accursed for Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.

To be dogmatical in attempting an explanation of any text among the number of those called difficult, is far from becoming any, but such as possess an infallibility of judgment, which your correspondent does not aspire to, nor expect. While, therefore, different interpretations have been given as to the apostle's meaning in the passage before cited, the following is humbly offered for the consideration of your readers, if it be not its most probable sense.

The term *accursed*, here used by the apostle in reference to himself, has been more generally supposed to mean either crucifixion or excommunication, both of which, in my view, are liable to strong objections. All are agreed in believing that Paul could not absolutely wish to be accursed according to the common acceptance of the word, as it respects the suffering of misery in a future state, and being deprived the salvation which is in Christ. Hence they consider it as an hyperbolical expression. But there appears to me a sense in which the apostle *could* really wish himself to be accursed for the sake of Israel. In the margin it is rendered for accursed, *separated*. Quere, if the apostle is not here to be understood, as intending his separation from Christ, in a way of carnal relation. Note, the apostle acknowledges the Jews as his brethren according to the *flesh*, and afterwards, enumerating

their outward and original privileges by which they were distinguished, he adds, *whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.* Now where was the propriety so much of his speaking of himself as a Jew, and Christ as the seed of Abraham, in this connexion, but on the supposition before advanced? It is well known that the Jews thought all others but those of their own nation, according to the *vulgar meaning*, accursed, and so in fact they were, but only outwardly, if we consider the terms, accursed and separated, synonymous. See Num. xxiii. 9. Amos. iii. 2.

The apostle, writing to a Gentile church, tells them, that, previous to a certain period, they were *without Christ*, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, and without God *in the world*; if it be asked, (thinking this does not give force enough to the apostle's language,) what could he have lost had he been of Gentile extraction altogether? We have an answer of his to an interrogation quite to the point: See Rom. iii. 1. What advantage then hath the Jew? Much every way. And be it remembered that this is spoken in argument, proving both Jew and Gentile being all under sin. None need be informed that the apostle might be separated from Christ, as has been mentioned, and yet joined to him in the most important sense. But after all, we know he only spoke thus after the manner of men.

Lond. Univer. Theo. Mag.

From the Reformer.

Our readers are informed that we never insert such pieces as the following, without knowing the responsibility of the writer; and in the present instance it is entitled to the fullest credit.

ED. REFORMER.

A gentleman of high respectability as a citizen, as well as a magistrate of distinguished eminence, in the state of New-Jersey, related to me, not long since, an occurrence relative to the missionary cause, which highly merits publicity. As your periodical publication has for its object the laudable design of exposing the *arts and stratagems of priestcraft*, in its various forms, for the purpose of undeceiving a *priestridden* community, I give it as nearly verbatim as my memory serves me, withholding at the same time the names, which, however, can be furnished you, if required. Of the truth of the facts, there cannot remain a doubt.

The Rev. Mr.—was sent by the missionary society of Connecticut, to labor for a limited time as a missionary in the state of Ohio. He entered on his mission, and during his itinerations on the missionary ground, a favourable opportunity presented for the purchase of a large tract of land, at a very reduced price. This temptation was too alluring to be misimproved, as the probability of a *fine speculation* would be the result. As he had some *ready funds* on hand, and *more* at command on his return, he ventured to hazard the purchase. Having fulfilled his mission, and rendered an account of his stewardship to the board, he declined any further appointment from them, and immediately prepared to secure the

darling object of his speculation. This he speedily accomplished, and took up his residence on his recent purchase. Some few years after, having already realized a nett profit of about twenty thousand dollars from his purchase, he was at a certain time travelling in Ohio, when he happened to fall in company with the gentleman from New-Jersey, then on a journey in that state. To him the late Rev. missionary related the circumstance of his appointment as a missionary, which resulted in the *fortunate speculation* which he had made. On the inquiry being put to him by the magistrate, which was the most *pleasant* employment, to *preach the Gospel* as a missionary, or to *engage in land speculation*? he replied, *D—n the preaching*, so long as I can make *more money by speculation*.

SALVATION OF GOOD MEN.

The following extract from "Price's Sermons," will show how erroneous were the conclusions even of a man who was enlightened and liberal, compared to his fellows. Is it not strange, that it did not occur to Mr. P. that *good men* stood in no need of salvation? Sinners only are to be saved. Mr. P. is very candid in acknowledging his *doubts and difficulties*.

EXTRACT.

"There are, probably, few speculative and inquiring men who do not sometimes find themselves in a state of dejection, which takes from them much of the satisfaction arising from their faith in very important and interesting truths. Happy, indeed, is the person who enjoys a flow of spirits so even and constant as never to have experienced this. Of myself I must say, that I have been far from being so happy. Doubts and difficulties have often perplexed me, and thrown a cloud over truths which, in the general course of my life, are my support and consolation. There are, however, many truths, the conviction of which I never lose. *ONE* conviction in particular remains with me amidst all fluctuations of temper and spirits. I mean my belief of the maxim in my text, that he *who walketh uprightly walketh surely*. There has not been a moment in which I have found it possible to doubt, whether the wisest and best course I can take is to practise virtue and to avoid guilt. Low spirits only give new force to this conviction, and cause it to make a deeper impression. Uncertainty in other instances *creates* certainty here; for the more dark and doubtful our state under God's government is, the more prudent it must be to choose that course which is the *safest*.

"I will only farther desire you to consider on this subject, with what serenity of mind a *good man* may proceed through life. Whatever is true or false, he has the consciousness of being on the *safe* side; and there is, in all cases, a particular satisfaction attending such a consciousness. A man knows himself in a safe way, goes on with composure and boldness. Thus may you go on in a course of well doing. You have none of those calamities to fear to which others are liable. If the doctrines of religion are true, you will be completely happy

through the Saviour of mankind. But should they not prove true, you will not be worse off than others. I have shown, on the contrary, that you will still be gainers. Your loss, in short, can be nothing. Your gain may be infinite."

THE ONE THING NEEDFUL.

"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" MICAH VI. 8.

Man requires of his fellow man, that he shall subscribe to dogmas and opinions, of man's invention; and threatens him with inexpressible wretchedness in case of neglect, or a refusal to comply. The prominent dogmas of the day, which are dignified with the name of the "doctrine of the reformation," and the "doctrine of the church," and is contained in "Creeds, Confessions, and Articles of Faith," is altogether foreign in its origin from the Scriptures, and has no connexion with the commands of God. God has shewed man what is good. God requires of man only that which is good. God has informed man, in the plainest language, of the whole duty, and has excluded every thing incompatible with reason and benevolence. God is "good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." He therefore calls upon man to behold his goodness, to imitate his justice and mercy, and to walk humbly in the path of divine rectitude.

Mankind are one great family. Their interest is one. An injury done to one, is done to the whole. All are brethren, and have equal claims to compassion and assistance. Justice requires this. Mercy also requires it. It is impossible to walk with God, who "is good to all," by being good only to a part. How contemptibly wicked and abominable do the opinions of those appear, who represent God as partial, good to a few, and unmerciful to a majority of his creatures. Reader, God "hath shewed thee what is good." God requires of thee nothing but goodness. Do justly. Regard all as objects of Divine favour, and be "kind, even to the unthankful and the evil." Love mercy. Let no consideration prevail with you to turn a deaf ear to the children of men, but imitate the great Father of mankind, and forgive your greatest enemy. Then you will walk with God, and exhibit that humility which becomes those who have themselves offended.

How impressive is the interrogation of the wise man! "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" How can you walk humbly with God, who is "good to all," if you are only good to a part? How can you walk with God, whose "tender mercies are over all his works," if your tender mercies are restricted to a few? If you are a Calvinist, or a Hopkinsian, or of any of the sects and parties who limit the mercy of God, consider your ways, and give heed to the divine exhortation, to "walk humbly with thy God." Remember his justice, mercy, and truth, and like him, do justly, and love mercy, however unworthy they may be with whom you have to do. This is good. A contrary course is evil, and will bring a sure reward.

PROPOSALS.

For printing by Subscription, a valuable Work, entitled "*A Dictionary of the New Testament*," Containing—An Explanation of more than eleven hundred words, and illustrating the most important subjects in that Book; by comparing and bringing together the different texts upon the same subject, so that the reader may find on the same page, what the New Testament writers have said upon the different parts of the doctrine of CHRIST.

The whole designed for the general use of all who love the Scriptures, without partiality to any sect or denomination.

N. B. This work to contain a short history of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb. By

ELIAS SMITH.

CONDITIONS.

1. To be printed on good paper, and fair type—containing about 500 pages, duodecimo.
2. To be afforded to Subscribers, at one dollar twenty-five cents, neatly bound and lettered.
3. Those who are accountable for eight copies, to receive one free.
4. To be put to press, as soon as five hundred subscribers are obtained.
5. Each book to contain an Engraving, or likeness of the Author.
6. Books to be sent to subscribers, (at their expense) and the money paid, when the work is delivered.

Subscriptions to be returned to the Author, in Boston, (Mass.) as soon as it is ascertained what number of Subscribers can be obtained. Boston, March, 1824.

Editors of papers who will give the above an insertion, and forward the paper that contains it to the Author, shall receive one copy when the work is published.



We invite the serious attention of our Subscribers to the Prospectus of the Fifth Volume of the GOSPEL HERALD, on the last page of this Number. Let all those who are disposed to favour the dissemination of Truth, and the refutation of error, and to patronize this paper for the attainment of this desirable object, reflect, that it is a matter of small concern with them, as individuals, whether they forward the amount of the subscription at the commencement of the Volume, or retain it during the year. It is only one dollar! But it is a very important concern with the Editor, whether he is enabled to meet the demands, which will come, whether the Subscribers pay or not. The payment of one dollar, IN ADVANCE, will be considered as infallible evidence that the party is a Subscriber.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

SUBJECT—Exodus xx. 9—11.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at seven o'clock.

In our remarks on a Calvinist's letter to his Nephew, we overlooked an interlineation, which concludes the extract in the present Number, and considered the writer to refer exclusively to Matt. xxv. 46, instead of Mark ix. 44. This will be noticed in our next.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE FIFTH VOLUME OF

The Gospel Herald.

It is deemed superfluous again to repeat the often avowed principles on which this Paper will be conducted. A reference to our former Prospectus will communicate all the necessary information on this head; while a recurrence to the past, will be the best guaranty for the IMPARTIALITY of our future proceedings. Our object is the investigation of GOSPEL TRUTH. The testimony of GOD, by "all His holy prophets,"—the asseverations of His Son, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things," and the corroborating witness of His apostles, are our evidences of the truth of what we admit, and what we assert. In our endeavours, to obtain the object mentioned, to move as an instrument in the hand of God, the common Father, the countenance and concurrence of the Friends of Truth are solicited, to aid in demolishing the dagon of popular error, dissipating the delusions of interested partisans, and erecting the Fabrick of Universal Charity on the ruins of infuriate zeal, and pampered ignorance. To that portion of the community, from whose faces the veil has been removed to discover the turpitude of the modern Missionary mania, the Pharisaism of its titled and fattened advocates, who gorge upon the spoils of sanctified extortion, we look for co-operation and support. We strengthen our appeal, by the declaration, that the columns of this Paper shall be open to the WORLD, and friends and foes be admitted to a participation of all the advantages which can result from a free expression of their sentiments, and defence of their views.

Preparatory to stating the CONDITIONS of the Fifth volume of the GOSPEL HERALD, it is proper to communicate the premises on which they are founded.

Experience, the guide to knowledge, has sanctions which prudence and human foresight must bow to. In all undertakings, whatever may tend to subvert the accomplishment of the purpose of the undertaker, must be cautiously guarded against, or partial defeat will be the result. The *Patrons* of this Paper, of necessity, are its only co-adjutors for its pecuniary support. Patrons indeed, and not patrons in word, will ensure the prosperity of the work, and enable its conductor to fulfil his engagements, and meet the reasonable expectations of all concerned for its continuance. *Four years'* experience has taught, that there are those who will

practise imposition, and that some who profess to be "hot," are scarcely "lukewarm" in the cause of all men. Our papers have been ordered for distant towns, and when forwarded in sufficient quantity to destroy a volume, refused to be taken. On other occasions, ordered, and the order afterwards denied. Our only mode of coercing payment, has been to leave subscribers to follow the bent of their *own inclination*. When the Paper was the exclusive property of the editor, during the publishing of the First and Second volumes, it was tendered gratuitously, at the conclusion of them, to all Subscribers who considered themselves *unable* to pay. If this is not sufficient to exculpate us from the charge of an overweening attachment to the mammon of this world, we have nothing more cogent to offer. We have made sacrifices which candour and reason cannot ask to be repeated, and the repetition of which, would jeopardize the existence of the establishment itself. No reason can be given, why an individual should, with individual means, sustain the burden which belongs to hundreds, and which divided and mutually borne, is no burden at all. The labour, expense, and variety of hindrance and exertion, indispensable to the conducting a Paper of this description, is far greater than those unacquainted will imagine. Ordinarily, every humane and Christian feeling should incline all to help each other, and facilitate the accomplishment of every thing that is conducive to human happiness. In the present case, there are peculiar claims. The object in view is of universal interest. Individual exertion is insufficient for the task. It is the duty, and should be the pleasure, of those professedly interested, to afford their mite of aid, and ensure the attainment of an end they acknowledge to be invaluable.

In accordance with the above stated premises and facts, the editor of this Paper feels himself honestly and honourably authorized, as well as imperiously urged, to call upon all sincere and liberal men, who are disposed to assist, to countenance the dissemination of Truth, and the refutation of Error, to aid, at this time, by complying with the following Conditions. A compliance with this request, will enable us to *know* our *Patrons*, and effectually guard us against the impositions of illiberal men.

CONDITIONS.

This work will be of the present (*Super Royal Octavo*) size; each Number containing *eight pages*, of two columns each; on fine paper.

This Paper will be printed on a *Bourgeois* type, of which this is a sample, and make a *Super-Royal Octavo* volume of 212 pages annually, including an Index to the contents, which will be delivered to Subscribers at the close of the year, to complete the volume.

The Fifth volume will commence in May, at the expiration of the present volume, and be published every other Saturday, devoted to theological discussion and inquiry, without regard to name, sect, or party.

The Subscription will be **ONE DOLLAR** per year, payable in **ADVANCE**!

New-York, April 17, 1824.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 24, 1824.

NO. 50.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

LETTER FROM AN UNCLE TO HIS NEPHEW.

(Concluded from page 337.)

I will now make a few remarks upon the rich man in *Hell*, and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom; or more particularly, upon the dialogue between the rich man and Abraham. It seems the rich man was importuning old faithful Abraham for some consolation, something that might mitigate his torment. But Abraham, who was faithful in this world, continued so where he was, and plainly gave him, though he was his son according to the flesh, to understand, that he had nothing to hope for. "Son," said he, "remember that thou in thy lifetime received thy good things." Mark, he did not say a part of thy good things, but thy good things, plainly implying that he had all the good things which he could with propriety hope for. Now if Abraham had been an Universalist, possessed of the *same spirit and feelings* as our modern Universalists, I think it is reasonable to suppose he would have replied to his son in language something like the following, viz. "My dear son, I condole with you in your present state of sufferings, I know indeed that your anguish and torment is very great, yet I have great consolation to offer you, for I assure you there is a glorious hope, nay a glorious certainty still before you; for, be assured, O my son, that at some future period, you will be released from your present doleful prison, and your anguish and torment will not only for ever have an end, but you will be admitted into the heavenly kingdom, be made an heir of glory, and be made more completely happy than you are now miserable. I say *more* completely happy, because your happiness and felicity will be without alloy, in that they will never end: but in your misery and torments you must have a mixture of joy, in knowing that they will have an end, and be succeeded by an uninterrupted state of blessedness throughout a never-ending eternity."

Thus far, my dear nephew, I have indulged myself in speculations. Now let me ask you, if you was placed in Abraham's stead, and continued to believe in the same doctrine that you now profess, would not your conversation be in substance somewhat like that which I have stated above, or rather is not your daily conversation now with such as are under the curse of the law, something similar to the above? and is this because you are a better, a more faithful and a more feeling man than Abraham?

I shall make no more remarks upon our Saviour's testimony as uttered by himself; but, as from what information I have gathered from reading the Gos-

pel Herald, (falsely as I conceive so called,) it appears to me, that the Universalists think to establish their doctrines principally from the writings of the apostles. On this point I will only say, that I have carefully examined their writings, and can find *nothing* therein to support, but much to condemn the doctrine of Universalism. They received their commission from their divine Master, which ran in these words—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be *damned*." And as far as I can understand language, they preached and wrote accordingly. They offered salvation to penitent and believing sinners; but I cannot find that they ever promised salvation to such as live and die impenitent and unbelieving. But if they had, their promise would have been vain, and worse than vain, because they had no commission so to do; and saint Paul says, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And I think you and I may venture to say, that if any of the apostles did, or any of the professed ministers of the gospel do, preach any other gospel than that which Christ commissioned his apostles to preach, let him that hath so done or shall so do, be accursed, except he repent; but more particularly if they have or do preach any doctrine which flatly contradicts any thing spoken by our divine Saviour.

I will now make a few remarks upon the word "*everlasting*." I have understood that those of your creed will not allow this word implies time *without end*; and in support of their denial say, "that the Scriptures speak also of the everlasting hills," and few or none believe that they will be of "*eternal* duration." In reply to this I would say, that in scripture things are spoken of according to their natures. Therefore, as the hills are built upon our earth, if they remain and be hills as long as the earth remains, they may and are with great propriety called the everlasting hills. But as respects our souls, I believe, and expect you do, that they will never cease to exist. And I conceive that a punishment of the soul cannot be termed *everlasting*, unless it continue as long as the soul continues to exist. But I recollect that in our conversation you said, "that the same word of the original which in some parts of scripture is translated *everlasting*, is in other parts translated *ages*." Well, admitting it to be so, then it follows, that the souls of the *finally impenitent* are to be punished for *ages*, and the next thing is to inquire, of what duration is an *age* of soul? I answer, that in its most extensive sense, the

word *age* implies the whole term of the existence of the subject spoken of; and in this sense, if the soul is to exist *eternally*, the punishment of the wicked will be eternal. But in the most limited sense, an *age* implies the term that the subject spoken of continues in any one particular mode of existence, and in this sense, the existence of souls may be divided into *three*, and only three ages. The *first*, the time of its existence in the body here on earth. The *second*, the time of its separate existence while the body shall lie in the grave. And the *third*, the time of its re-united existence with the body. This age will commence at the resurrection, and will have no end. As my paper is nearly full, I leave you to comment, and shall only add, that I hope you will receive what I have written in a spirit of love, and believe me to be your soul's well wisher, and affectionate uncle. J. M.

REMARKS.

Mr. M.'s conclusion, that the phrase "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," is the most forcible that he can conceive, to express the *endless* duration of punishment, is shown to be fallacious as follows: Mr. M.'s conception of a thing or principle, cannot affect the thing or principle. The words "*where their worm dieth not*," signifies only that their worm does not die so long as the party are in the *state* spoken of. There is no allusion to the *duration* of the state, or the continuance of the party in the state. The words, "and the fire is not quenched," has reference to the state in the *present* tense; but no allusion to the future whatever. If the connexion is examined, it will be found that Christ's disciples were addressed; and that the language is highly figurative. If it is considered as a figurative description of the consequences which result to men, in this life, from the exercise of unjustifiable authority, all difficulty vanishes. If it is considered literally, every man, whose members may have offended, must be amenable to the file. Therefore, unless Mr. M. is *perfect*, he is an offender, and has sealed his own damnation. We presume Mr. M. has not *cut off* his members, to save his soul!

Mr. M. considers the passage quoted from Luke xvi. as literal. As a parable, it is harmonious in all its parts, and supports the doctrine we advocate. As a literal narration, it disagrees with Mr. M.'s faith as well as with ours. However, he has taken his side, and can avail himself of all the advantages which the perversion can afford him. But, he must admit the translation to be wrong, and let *Hades*, here rendered *hell*, signify *grave*, which is the meaning given to the word by our translators, in 1 Cor. xv. 55. Now, Sir, examine the subject. Your dialogue is spoken in the *grave*. The *dead body* of the rich man is the speaker. His *spirit* has nothing to do with Abraham. We read, "Then shall the *dust* return to the *earth* as it was; and the *spirit* to God who gave it." The *dust*, in the *earth* (for the *grave* is in the earth,) talks with Abraham. The beggar is in Abraham's bosom. He is not *buried*. Abraham's bosom, literally, is the receptacle of the beggar, and not the grave. Sir, you must admit,

that literally, Christ, after his crucifixion, was buried in the same place with the rich man; in *Hades*. Christ was not carried to Abraham's bosom. Christ told the thief on the cross—"To-day shalt thou be with me in *paradise*." Not in Abraham's bosom. You, Sir, have the *dust* for your *hell*, and *Abraham's bosom* for your *heaven*. We will admit, without controversy, that almost all mankind go to the hell, the *Hades*, the grave, you speak of. At the resurrection the song will be sung, O *Hades*, grave, (or, if you like it better,) *hell*, where is thy victory? You, Sir, may answer the question.

The beggar, in his lifetime, received *evil* things. Then he deserved them. A prophet says, "I have been young, and *now* am old; yet have I not seen the *righteous forsaken*, nor his seed *begging bread*." (Psa. xxxvii. 25.) Will Mr. M. pretend, that the beggar is blessed in another world, to pay him for his sufferings in this? That the rich man is damned in eternity, as a set-off to his enjoyments in time? Are "good things" confined to the present mode of being?

Mr. M. considers, that a modern Universalist would have replied differently to the rich man. We think not. The rich man, it appears, was not anxious about the *duration* of his torment. It would be superfluous to say more. Mr. M. can inform what a Calvinist would say under these circumstances. We have considered this parable at large; those who desire to obtain more light on the subject, can do it. We ask Mr. M. what authority he has for considering this parable of Christ, a literal narration?

Mr. M. considers this paper to be *falsely* called the *Gospel Herald*. Will Mr. M. admit, that his opinion of this paper, and the paper, are two things? He says, *it appears to him*, that Universalists think to establish their doctrines principally from the writings of the apostles. We want no better evidence than this, to prove that Mr. M. has read the *Gospel Herald* very *superficially*. He also says, he has examined the writings of the apostles, and can find *nothing* therein to support, but much to condemn the doctrine. This may be very true. Mr. M. may be so prejudiced and blinded, as to mistake or overlook the prominent truths of revelation. He quotes Mark xvi. 16, to support his opinion. Why, Sir, we not only admit, but contend for the truth of this declaration. But for your information, we shall state, that the word *damnation*, however it may please some men to consider it as meaning torments in a future state, has, for its foundation, the original of the term *condemnation*, in John iii. 18, 19. The unbeliever is condemned *already*. (See Rom. iii. 19, 24.) Christ's apostles never said a word about "living and dying impenitent," and of the "endless misery of the finally impenitent." The gospel which is made up of such expressions, has not God for its author, nor Paul for its preacher! You will learn the gospel of Paul, by reading Gal. iii. 8. You will also learn, by consulting this chapter, that the promise of God is to Christ, the seed of Abraham. That the law is not against the promises.

That believers receive the promise. You will find the promise in Psa. ii. 7, 8. "I will declare the decree: The Lord hath said unto me, Thou my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give the *heathen* thine inheritance, and the *uttermost parts of the earth* thy possession." We ask Mr. M. whether he has received these promises, or the promise of John Calvin, of the salvation of a *few* elect, and the damnation of the *heathen*? Have you received the *decree* which God has declared, or Calvin's *decree* of unmerciful reprobation?

Mr. M. concludes his letter with remarks on the word *everlasting*. Of these remarks, we say, they are an expression of Mr. M.'s opinion, right or wrong. We do not consider them of sufficient consequence to require any reply, otherwise than to say, that we prefer the Scripture use and definition of words to the opinion of Mr. M. We have so frequently, in the present volume, examined objections of this nature, that our readers would not have patience to go through a repetition of them.

We will now show Mr. M.'s doctrine, and accommodate him with a subject for honest, wholesome, and thorough animadversion. Namely, the errors of
CALVINISM.

"There is an eternal divine determination, which respects all beings, actions, and events."

B. 1. ch. 16, and B. 3. ch. 22.

"Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, whereby he had it determined by himself what he willed to become of every man. For all are not created to *like estate*: but to some *eternal life*, and to some *eternal damnation* was fore-appointed. Therefore as every man is created to the one or other end, so we say that he is predestinated either to life or death."

B. 3. ch. 21. sec. 5.

"There is an election of nations to privileges, and of individuals to an interest in Christ, unto salvation."

B. 3. ch. 21 and 22 *passim*.

"The *decree of election* consists, in the Father's giving to the Son, Christ Jesus, a *definite number* of our fallen race, to be atoned for by his blood, sanctified through the purchased influences of the Spirit, and thus *chosen in him* to eternal life."

Inst. B. 3. ch. 24. sec. 5, 6.

"That therefore which the scripture clearly sheweth, we say, that God by eternal and *unchangeable counsel* hath once appointed whom in time to come he would take to salvation. This counsel as touching the elect, we say is grounded upon his *free mercy* without any respect to the *worthiness* of man, but whom he appointeth to *damnation*, to them, by his just indeed, and irreprehensible, but also incomprehensible judgment, the *entry of life is blocked up*."

B. 3. ch. 22. sec. 7. and ch. 23. sec. 8.

"The decrees were not formed in consequence of any foresight of sin or holiness, in the reprobate or elect." B. 3. ch. 22. sec. 11. and B. 3. ch. 24. sec. 11, 12, 13, 14.

We recommend to Mr. M. to examine the following passages, and compare them with his doctrine. Gen. xxii. 15-18. Psa. ii. 7, 8. Rev. iv. 11. Ephes. i. 9-11. Heb. ii. 9. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. John vi. 33. Isa. xxv. 6-8. xlii. xlv. 22-25. Rom. iv. 13-16. Psa.

lxxxvi. 9. Finally, we wish Mr. M. to settle the question, to his own satisfaction, *who* those are, whether *elect* or *non-elect*, whom Paul speaks of, Rom. xi. as being *blinded*,—as *bowing down their back away*,—as having *stumbled*, &c.? Having done this, we shall be glad to hear from him!

Note. We consider the whole of Scripture to support the doctrine we advocate. The *few* passages quoted above, are given merely to have them contrasted with Calvinism, in the order in which the subject stands. If the reader will take the trouble to refer to them, and compare Calvin's declarations with them, he will behold the vast difference between truth and error.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz—You have called on Episcopalians, in your last Herald, to answer for the supplicating Jesus Christ; and ask them, if *God* was born, circumcised, &c. and conclude, with declaring, if they believe so, they must outrage reason and deny the Scriptures. From this declaration it would seem, that you consider Jesus of Nazareth, only in the character of a *good man*, whose benevolence was so great, his whole life was engaged in preaching morality, and endeavouring to soften by persuasion and tears the rude passions of our nature; and, at the same time, to leave an example for *good men* to imitate in succeeding generations.

Your answer to the following questions would be acceptable to the subscriber.

1. Was Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, of whose conception and birth we have such an extraordinary account, Matt. i. 18—25. inclusive, *God*, or *man*, or both?

2. If he was *man* only, such as Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, would it not be *idolatry* in me to worship him?

3. If he was *God*, as say the trinitarians, who took upon himself the human with the divine nature, and by his suffering of the death of the cross, paid all demands against the offspring of Adam, am I not bound to worship him as *God my Saviour*?

Yours, A. B.

Trenton, (N. J.) April 9, 1824.

ANSWER.

To A. B.'s first question, Whether Jesus Christ, who was born of the virgin Mary, &c. was *God*, or *man*, or *both*? we reply—He was the *Son* of God, a *man* approved of God. See John i. 34, 49; iii. 16, 17. Acts ii. 22.

To the second question we answer in the affirmative; asserting, as our opinion, that, to say nothing of idolatry, it is ignorance to worship Jesus Christ as any being but the Son of God. Paul says, (1 Tim. ii. 5.) "One GOD, and one MEDIATOR between GOD and MEN, the *man* Christ Jesus." Was Paul mistaken? Should he have said, The mediator is *God*? Is not *God one*? Is not the mediator *one*? How many are *twice one*?

Of the last interrogation of A. B. we must say, that, if Christ was GOD, and God is unchangeable, he is God *now*; and if there is but *one* God, as the Scriptures assert, A. B. cannot worship any God but

Christ; for the plain reason that there is no other God to worship. Paul, (Ephes. i. 17.) speaks of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory." He also declares, "One GOD and Father of all." If you worship Jesus Christ as the "one God and Father of all," you do not worship him as the Son of God. You do not "believe on the Son;" instead of admitting that the "Father sent the Son," you deny it, and assert that the Father came himself, as the Son—of whom, we would ask? of Himself, think ye?

It is affirmed of Christ, that he said, "I and the Father are one." It is also affirmed of Christ, that he said, (Matt. xxv. 40.) "In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Christ here recognizes mankind as his brethren. He speaks of God, as his Father. Will you pretend that the least among Christ's brethren is Christ?

Again. Christ said, (John v. 22, 23.) "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." Will you, can you believe, that the Son judgeth no man? Do you honour the Son, when you assert that God the Father is the Son? Or the Father, when you assert that the Son is the Father? Suppose a case. When the King of France sent his son, (for such he called) the Duke D'Angouleme, into Spain, and gave orders that all should honour the son, the Duke, even as they honoured the father, the King, was it necessary, in complying with this requisition, to assert that the Duke and the King were one? That the King came himself? And all communications made to the Duke, to be addressed to the King? Would not this be honouring the King exclusively, and leaving the Duke altogether out of the question? If obedience were rendered the Duke, the same as was due the King, he would be honoured the same as the King.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—The following which was copied from an English paper, I send for insertion in the Gospel Herald; presuming that it will not be uninteresting to many of the readers of your valuable paper. It affords another proof that the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity does not occur to the mind of a child, even when learning the Trinitarian creed and catechism, which have, alas! too often been substituted for the plain and simple truths of the gospel.

E. P. A.

Mount Pleasant, April 11th, 1824.

Theological Acuteness of a Child.

"A child, aged about ten years and a half, on a visit to her relations, had observed the term Unitarian on the front of the chapel where they attended. Her uncle inquired if she knew the meaning of the term, or the difference between the term Unitarian and Trinitarian? She replied in the negative. It was then explained to her. She was told, that Unitarians acknowledge God the Father as the one supreme and only God; and that Jesus was the Mes-

siah, the Messenger, &c. &c. sent of God; and that Trinitarians worshipped God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and yet said, they were not three Gods, but one. She was informed the latter was the belief professed and taught at the chapel where (when at home) she attended; also taught in the Catechisms she had given her at the Sunday school to learn.

"She replied—Mr. —, naming the minister of the Independent meeting where her parents attended, does not believe that Jesus is God. Her aunt replied; Were you to ask him the question, I believe he would tell you, that Jesus is God. (I give her answer in her own words, that I may convey her own ideas.) 'If they think Jesus is God, then we had no God while Jesus was dead; and who took care of us till he arose from the dead? Beside, added she, they must then have sacrificed God, if Jesus were God. I think, said she, the Father is God, and Jesus could do the same things as God, because God gave him that power; therefore he could not himself be God.' She has since been diligent, when looking at her Catechisms, to compare them with Scripture, and to refer to them for proof, and says, she has not yet found in the Scriptures that Jesus is God."

"Portsmouth, Eng. April 25th, 1823."

From the (Cumberland) Gospel Palladium.

MINISTERIAL TITLES.

MR. EDITOR—I observe that you copied into the Palladium, of the 11th ult. with approbation, "A SMALL REQUEST," from the Gospel Herald. In making his request that Brother Editors would omit the word REVEREND, affixed to the name of Brethren who publicly advocate the truth, the Herald takes occasion to animadvert with some severity, but, it must be allowed, with frankness and candour, upon the use of this title when applied to men, because it is, as he affirms, exclusively the property of JEHOVAH. He avers that he has conscientious scruples in relation to this matter. I certainly respect his scruples, and most sincerely recommend a compliance with his request. At the same time, I beg leave to declare my conviction that his scruples are the offspring of misapprehension. In the use or application of this title, I apprehend nothing more is intended than a mere indication or designation of character or profession, which convenience seems to require.

There is nothing in the *quo animo* which is criminal or irreverent, any more than in the use of the title Elder or Deacon. It will not be pretended that, in the use of it, Divine honour is intended to be conferred or claimed. The Herald says, "he never knew a reverend preacher of the truth." He must have known preachers bearing this title whom, in the common acceptance of the words, he revered, in other words, whom he respected. He does not mean to be understood that there is not a preacher bearing this title who is a sincere Christian.

But the question to be considered is this: Is not the assumption, that the title REVEREND, is meant, as the Herald supposes, to be appropriated exclusively

to JEHOVAH, a mistake? The wife is commanded to reverence her husband. Ephes. v. 33. We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence. Heb. xii. 9. The text says—Holy and reverend is his name. Psa. cxi. 9. Now if reverend is to be considered exclusively the property of Jehovah, holy must also be so considered; they cannot be separated. But holy in the Scriptures, is applied and appropriated to men. We find *holy men* of old—*holy people*, &c. in many parts of the Bible. This appears to me quite conclusive upon the question.

BAXTER.

Remarks by the Editor of the Palladium.

Although our correspondent may duly respect "the conscientious scruples" of the Editor of the *Gospel Herald*, if he considers him as labouring under the influence of "misapprehension" of the subject, we cannot perceive any consistency in his "recommending a compliance with his request." If the request of the Editor of the *Herald* is the fruit of ignorance, or, as Mr. Woodworth would have it, *squeamishness*, no matter how honest he may be in his scruples, let us by all means refuse compliance. This is the question at issue; consequently we refer the remarks of Baxter to the consideration of the *Herald*, and invite further communications from our intelligent, though unknown, correspondent.

REMARKS.

We agree with the Editor of the GOSPEL PALLADIUM, and cannot "perceive any consistency in" BAXTER's "recommending a compliance with our request," while he considers the practice we disapprove as harmless, or justifiable. In adverting to the passage quoted, Psa. cxi. 9, it will be seen, that the term *reverend* has a relation to the name JEHOVAH; it will be admitted, we presume, that the name JEHOVAH cannot with any propriety be applied to any man. Will it be pretended, that proper appellations for men, are justly characterized by the term *reverend*? If so, on what principle? What constitutional or just affinity exists, between the name of men and Deity, or between men, and the Deity's name? The name of man, in the aggregate, is one. Various appellations are used to distinguish one man from another man; without regard to their merits or demerits, and having no connexion with any existing relations which can possibly determine the character of the parties.

Mr. Johnson Chase, of this city, has a brass plate on the door of the house where he resides, on which is graven "Reverend Johnson Chase." What are we to understand from this inscription? That the word *Johnson* is reverend? That the word *Chase* is reverend? That the words *Johnson Chase* are reverend? Or, that the man who bears this name, or names, is reverend? If the appellation *Johnson* is reverend, then it has no relation to the man who bears it. The same may be said of the word *Chase*. If the man is reverend, then he is so independent of his name, and would be so, even if his name had the most ridiculous or trifling signification affixed to it, which we can imagine. Pray, let this matter be determined. Inform us, whether the name of the man, or the man himself be reverend? If the em-

ployment of the man, or his office is entitled to this term, the man is out of the question. It is true we read of an "holy calling." Now this "holy calling" may be to *unholy* men. It is an "holy calling," because the Being who calls is Holy.

Let us examine the passage in question. It says, "Holy and reverend is his name." Who is spoken of? Ans. The Deity. What is His Name? See Ex. iii. 15. "And God [I AM THAT I AM,] said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: *this is my name for ever*, and this is my memorial to all generations." Again: Ex. vi. 2, 3, "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I the LORD. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of* God Almighty; but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them." Again: Psa. lxxxiii. 18. "Whose name alone is JEHOVAH, the Most High over all the earth." Now apply the passage under discussion—"Holy and reverend is his Name." Also, "Whose name alone is JEHOVAH." And now read (and we write it with shame and compunction) the "Reverend Johnson Chase. If God Almighty's name is *reverend*, and His name alone is JEHOVAH, then the name of God Almighty, *alone*, is *reverend*. The term used in the revelation of God, as applicable to His name, who assumes the name as His exclusive prerogative, ought not to be compounded with the name of a frail sinful mortal, of yesterday, and emblazoned on his door, or any way assumed, and made a show of as his right, property, or title.

We now ask, and we ask it seriously, Are our "scruples the offspring of misapprehension?" Is "nothing more," or is as much, intended, as "a mere indication or designation of character or profession?" We heartily wish that not only the characters of clergymen, but of laymen also, possessed that real merit, in the sight of God, which would justly entitle them to a complimentary appellation. But, how will the character of clergymen, and the name of Deity appear together? And if the profession is to be qualified, how humble and unassuming ought it to be? Surely, if convenience only is sought, how many terms might be used to designate those who have separated themselves to preach "good tidings?" Paul distinguished himself; but it was by the title of *apostle*, and *chief of sinners*.

Baxter says, "There is nothing in the *quo animo* which is criminal," &c. We will not pretend to think, that those who assume this adjective arrogate, privately, a pre-eminence over the heads of their fellows, which approximates to the elevation of the Deity's supremacy. But we believe, that every honest man among them, will confess that he has more vanity than is good for him. Baxter finally

*The words in *Italics* are a supply. We understand the passage as follows—I appeared unto Abraham, &c. I, God Almighty appeared, &c. but, by my name, JEHOVAH, was I not known unto them. That is, I did not tell them that JEHOVAH is my name.

uses the term as convertible with *respect*. It is our duty to respect all men; but we respect them for what they are. They are *men*. We do not say, "*Holy and reverend* is their name."

But Baxter descends to close particulars, in saying, "He does not mean to be understood that there is not a preacher bearing this title who is a *sincere Christian*." True, we have never meant this.—Some may have accepted this title as a complimentary gift from their fellows, and hung it up as a toy or a rattle. Others may have assumed it for fashion's sake, as a matter of course, and being pleased with the sound, give themselves little trouble to examine the merits of the case. But we have our doubts, whether a *sincere* Christian will assume, hold, or use the title, after he has sincerely examined into his right to it.

The two instances noticed where the word *reverence* occurs, we think does not make for Baxter's conclusion. This term is there used as convertible with *obey* and *obedience*. That the party should, and did, acknowledge the *authority* of those spoken of. Baxter says, "If *reverend* is to be considered *exclusively* the property of *JEHOVAH*, holy must also be so considered—they cannot be separated." Why so? Because Baxter says, "But holy in the Scriptures, is applied and appropriated to men. We find *holy* men of old—*holy* people, &c. in many parts of the Bible. This appears to me quite conclusive upon the question." It does not appear so to us, for the following reasons—First: *Men* are not called *reverend* in the Scriptures. Second: It is affirmed, positively, of God, that his *name only is holy*. (See Rev. xv. 4.) Or, that God only is holy. There must be a qualification. Therefore we read, that "holy men spake as they were moved by the *Holy Spirit*." We think this conclusive. In addition to this, however, is the consideration that the word *holy* is not applied to designate the *name* of a man. If you were writing an account of ministers of the gospel, and should say, that they were men whom you *reverenced*, and should be understood to qualify your expression, to signify that you *reverenced* them only as they were moved by the Holy Spirit to minister in holy things; and that nothing is holy but that which God has commanded, the case would be different. Consider the man whom you call *reverend*, doing wrong. Is he *reverend* then? What has man whereof to glory?

The term *reverend* is applied to the *name* of Deity. When you use this term, and apply it to men, we inquire, Is the *name* of the man *reverend*? Is the *character* of the man *reverend*? Is the office or *profession* of the man *reverend*? Or, is the *man*, distinct from his name, &c. *reverend*? When you say *Reverend Mr. &c.* as the case may be, *who*, or *what* do you mean is *reverend*?

We regret to be obliged to add, that many clergymen of the present day, are fond of titles, and are great lovers of the world, and the things of the world. We find them actually *assuming* the title of *reverend*, they tack it to their names, with as much pleasure and obstinacy, as a *corporal* in a new settlement, will stick to the fancied dignity

which he supposes he enjoys above his fellows. We believe, and unceremoniously express our belief, that the old "*leaven* of the Pharisees" is still working. The "*greetings in the markets*" are not yet forgotten. *Rabbi!* sounds well in the ears of men who cherish pride, and nourish a spirit of opposition to the humble doctrine of Christ. The main object appears to be popularity and cash. There is some truth in the old declaration; "That a man's pretensions are the standard by which the world generally judge of his merit." A man assumes the title of *reverend*—almost secludes himself from his fellows; saving a proper intercourse with the rich and honourable in the world's opinion. Now, the clothing must be more expensive. A large and better house, and more fashionable furniture must be obtained. The *reverend* gentleman must, in a word, live in style! He struts the streets like a turkey cock; and receives the greetings and civilities of the wondering and almost-adoring multitude, with the dignity of a petty prince. His salary must correspond with his dignity. He is a *GREAT man*. A *great* man and a *small* salary, would be worse than the sin of witchcraft. He cannot maintain his family. The man, dignified with a title stripped from the name of God Almighty, will support his dignity, and woe betide the miscreant who does not bow to his authority.

We have already extended this article beyond what we contemplated; but we trust our readers will bear with us, while we advert to the usages in the Jewish Church, in the time of Moses, and during the time of Christ's apostles, at the commencement of the Christian era, in the church of Christ.

Aaron is spoken of as selected to minister in the priest's office. We read of no title other than priest, or high priest. This title is expressive of the office of the party. Aaron and his successors in the priestly office, are not designated as, nor called *reverend*. Surely, if any had been authorized to assume this title, Aaron, who was made or constituted a priest, for a whole nation, by the immediate appointment of God, has been. But where do we read of his assuming titles?

Among Christian ministers, Paul stands conspicuous. He says, he was called to be an *apostle*, or messenger of the people. His commission was an undoubted one, and it was broad, he being sent to the Gentiles, or nations. Do we read that Paul assumed a title to distinguish him from others? Was this title *reverend*? Paul informs us of the extent of the commission given by Christ; and the appellations which he authorized. Namely: "He gave some, apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers." Paul also enumerates the reasons for this, as follows: "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," &c. (Ephes. iv. 11, 12.) We also read of the offices of bishop, deacon, and elder; which are rather modifications of those before spoken of; who are appointed to the same end.

It will be conceded that the title we object to, has been assumed and used since the days of the apos-

ties, who received their appointment immediately from Christ. This concession substantiates the truth of the declaration, that it is *superfluous*. It is a departure from the simplicity of Christ. It has nothing to approve it, save the influence of those who have coveted it.

What would be the expression of the opinion of sober men of good sense, should clergymen assume the title of *major-general*? Should they assume this, would it be less objectionable than the one they have assumed? It would be said, They have arrogated a title which belongs to others. The same must be said in the present instance. It would be said, They have assumed a title which is not expressive of their character, and to which they can have no claim. We can say, of the *name* of the Deity, that it is necessarily expressive of his glorious being, character, and perfections. This transcendently great *Name is reverend*. If clergymen have an affinity now, an existing relation, exclusive with them, to the perfections of God, they are entitled to be distinguished as God Almighty's name is distinguished. Will any one pretend this is the case? If not, does it not follow, that they are not authorized to assume the distinguishing appellation which an inspired writer has applied to the name of the Deity, who is above all praise, and who requires of his creatures, that they should lay prostrate in the dust before him?

We conclude with the remark, that, in our opinion, if no other objection could be brought against this practice of assuming the title of reverend, it would be quite sufficient to bring it into disrepute with a candid community, and to discourage the countenancing of it in future, that it is a fancied dignity which is very expensive to support, and which has a direct tendency to generate pride and extravagance in all who assume it.

Note—If we were to take the liberty of giving advice, in this business, we would say, If something is necessary to distinguish preachers of the Gospel of God our Saviour, from other men, affix G. M. (Minister of the Gospel) to their names. This would be all-sufficient.

From the (Boston) Universalist Magazine.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.

"Who shall be destroyed; the people or the devil?"

About four years ago, an association of people, called Universalists, was holden in the state of Maine. Capt. S—, from R—, attended. On his return home, he called on an old acquaintance, a Congregational Deacon, who invited him to stop and dine. He accepted the invitation. "Well," said the Deacon, "where have you been journeying?" To our association. Who preached? Several, and among others, Mr. S—, from B—. Ay, was he there? What had he to say? Why, says Capt. S—, he told us that the devil would be destroyed, and the people delivered, instead of the common doctrine of the day, which teaches that the devil will be saved, and the people destroyed. That, said the Deacon, is strange doctrine, that is not in my Bible, the devil will live for ever: Where was his text? In

Heb. ii. 14, 15. "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." My Bible, said the Deacon, does not read so. He called for a Testament, and found it read the same. He then called for another;—that read the same. By this time he was much agitated, and called for his English Bible, and said to Capt. S. "There is no dependance on the American Testaments." He read his European Bible, which read the same. It does read so, Captain; but it appears to me that it cannot mean as it says, for I have always thought the devil would live for ever, and the people be destroyed. Why Captain, if that text is true, all men will be saved. Have you any objection to that, Deacon? No, no,—if it is God's will, I have not. Sir, Paul says, "Who will have all men to be saved." This ended the conversation on that subject.

Doubtless multitudes have read the above text with as much inattention as the Deacon. To such we say in the words of Jesus, "*Let him that readeth, understand.*"

From the American Eagle, printed at Litchfield, Con.
MISSIONARY CAUSE.

Pious Fraud.—The following statement of facts may be relied on as true, and capable of legal proof.

The Rev. Mr.—, a settled minister in the South Association of Litchfield county, in his ordinary performance of the professional duty of a clergyman, was particularly zealous in the missionary cause, begging with uncommon zeal and success "for the treasury of the Lord," as he, by way of comparison, calls the treasury of the Foreign Missionary Society. His congregation, consisting of plain and intelligent people of industrious and frugal habits, were inclined to no extremity of opinion or conduct, having been taught "to walk in the good old way," under the pastoral instruction of a sensible, pious, and venerable divine of the old school.

Among the various other expedients to which this Rev. Clergyman resorted to gather money, was the following. A *sewing meeting*, for the females of his parish, was appointed at the house of the Rev. Pastor. Pursuant to notice given, a numerous collection of ladies convened. After they were well employed in the business and object of their meeting, the Rev. Clergyman proposed they should make a *contribution for missionary purposes*, and produced the *missionary box*, accompanied with some such remarks on the utility and duty of giving to the missionary cause, as were appropriate. Most of the ladies present expressed their willingness to give, but alleged they did not expect a contribution, and were unprepared. To this the Rev. Clergyman replied, that the circumstance of their having no money, made no difference, as each lady disposed to give, could *signify on a piece of paper* the sum she was willing to give, and *deposit this paper* in the missionary box, and afterwards, as should be convenient, pay to him the amount by each expressed on the paper to be paid. By his assistance, each stipulated on paper the amount she was willing to pay,

and these papers or tickets were received by the Reverend Clergyman, and deposited in the missionary box.

The ladies called from time to time and paid the sums respectively engaged to be paid, *but did not take up the papers or tickets.*

At this time a young gentleman of respectable family and connexions in that town, was pursuing a course of classical study at the Rev. Gentleman's house, under his direction. The Rev. Clergyman one day observed to this young gentleman, that the ladies of the parish had engaged, on paper, to pay several small sums, as before mentioned, but HAD NOT paid the sums promised, and recommended to the young gentleman to pay the sums by each lady subscribed, and take up the tickets, as a matter of *politeness and gallantry* to the ladies. To this the young man consented, and actually paid the amount to the Rev. Clergyman, and received from him the tickets.

Such are the facts, and as they furnish some new and profitable ideas on the subject of receiving money for missionary purposes, it is believed important to the "friends of missions" that they should receive publicity. They certainly furnish valuable hints to the *carnal world* how to dispose of *satisfied paper contracts* to advantage.

(From the same Paper.)

Mr. Editor,—The following facts may be relied on as having occurred within the last six months. The daughter of a very poor man, who is supported as a State pauper, believing it her duty to give for the benefit of the heathen, or contribute to the missionary cause, called upon the Rev. Pastor of the parish to which she belongs, and presented him with a gown pattern for the benefit of the Elliott or Choc-taw mission. This gown was received by the Clergyman, and deposited among the articles of clothing by him received for that purpose. The girl has no means, other than her own labor, to procure money. Her mother has not for some months attended public worship for want of clothes. Her smaller sister cannot attend school for want of shoes; and the family, in addition to the small aid received from the State, of about 70 cents per week, are supported by begging from one house to another; a little indian meal here, a little milk there, and a little meat in another place; and all these facts exist and occur daily before the Rev. Clergyman, and his immediate neighborhood.

Is it the duty of this girl to give? Is it the duty of this Clergyman, under these circumstances, to receive?

NOTE. The "*American Eagle*" has become one of the most interesting weekly papers in the Union, on the subject of missions and the clerical schemes of the day. We are much pleased to see the bold and independent stand the Editor has made against the artful and unwarrantable plans which are adopted to obtain money from the people, *under pretence* of spreading the Gospel and saving the souls of men. Living near the Cornwall Missionary School, and in the neighborhood of the noted or rather ne-

torious Lyman Beecher, and withal, being a member of the Congregation or Presbyterian Society, he has had an opportunity to judge of the merits of the cause in which the clergy are now so earnestly and perseveringly engaged. The result has been that he has seen the propriety and necessity of coming out against the missionary or rather monied operation now carrying on. His statements and remarks have awakened up inquiry in Connecticut; and it is satisfactory to learn, that the patrons of his paper are fast increasing. "More than one hundred and sixty new subscribers," says the Editor, "have been received in the last five weeks." Those who wish to become acquainted with the proceedings of the clergy in New England, and see their schemes exposed, and are in circumstances to afford it, will not be doing any injustice to themselves by subscribing for this paper. It is published by Isaiah Bunce, Litchfield, Connecticut, at two dollars a year.

Phila. Reformer.

FAITHFUL PREACHING.

"I have preached righteousness in the great congregation; lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest. I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving kindness and thy truth from the great congregation." Psal. xl. 9, 10.

We recommend the above declaration of the prophet to the popular clergymen of the present day. We ask them, whether they can make the same declaration with the prophet? Have you preached righteousness, (mercy) to all? Have you not refrained your lips? Have you not hid God's righteousness, (mercy) within your heart? Have you declared God's faithfulness, and his salvation? Have you not concealed his *loving kindness* and truth, from the great congregation?

We have evidence that the prophet told the truth. We wish we could say as much of you. David declared, of the *mercy* of God, that it *endureth for ever*. He declared the faithfulness of God, that *all* nations whom he hath made shall come and worship before him. Of his *salvation*, that *all* the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord. Of his *loving kindness*, that it is better than life. Of his *truth*, that the world shall be established that it shall not be moved; for he shall judge the people *righteously*. (See Psal. xcvi.)

PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

LAST NIGHT OF MEETING FOR THE SEASON.

Subject—1 Cor. xi. 26.

The "Society for the Investigation and Establishment of Gospel Truth," will meet at Tolerton's Academy, 63 Chrystie-street, on TUESDAY Evening next, at half past seven o'clock. After the discussion of the subject named for the evening, the Society will *adjourn*, to meet the first Tuesday evening in November next, at six o'clock.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSTIE-STREET.

Payable in Advance.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1824.

NO. 51.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Editor—The present appears to be an age of general inquiry after *truth*; and I, for one, having a desire that truth may speedily prevail, and dispel every dark cloud of error and superstition, would direct your attention to that passage of Scripture which relates to Christ warning his disciples not to fear man, but forewarning them whom they should fear. Namely, Luke xii. 4, 5.

I wish you to look at this passage with its connexion, give it an impartial investigation, and inform me, whether this passage, with its connexion, will authorize a belief in the doctrine of *future punishment*, posterior to this mode of being? A compliance with the above request, will oblige

A FRIEND.

REMARKS.

"And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more that they can do: But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear. Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." Luke xii. 4, 5.

We think it will be admitted without controversy, that Christ advises his disciples not to *fear man*. There is a reason assigned, by Christ, why his disciples should not fear man. It is this: Man can only kill the *body*. We infer from this, that the consequences which result from the destruction, or demise, of the *body*, are not such as to authorize or produce fear, in an enlightened mind. Man can kill the body. Our fellows, if they please, can sever the brittle cord of life, and usher us, in a moment, into that

— "Undiscovered country,
From whose bourne no traveller returns."

Even this, in all its various bearings and results, should not excite *fear*. But the present life is a probationary state, on the improvement of which, depends the future and endless destiny of man. Well, if this be the case, Christ spoke at random, when he said, Fear not them which can *end your probationary state*, and ere your reckoning is paid in precautionary virtues and good works, shall send you, unprepared, to meet your Judge, and enter on the realities of an endless scene. This must be the amount of Christ's declaration, according to modern opinions; and according to modern opinions there would be the greatest cause of fear, even of them who can kill the body; for thereby, they destroy the whole man for eternity. However, Christ says, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." There is no consequence of moment which can result from the

death of the body, unfavourable to the party to authorize fear.

This is mere sophistry. For Christ immediately says, "I will forewarn you *whom* you shall fear." Now there is just ground of fear, or Christ would not forewarn them. And Christ adds, "Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath *power* to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, *Fear him*." God, therefore, has *power* to destroy both soul and body in hell.

We grant it. Will God do this? Shall we fear every evil and harm, which *Almighty* power, unrestrained by *wisdom and goodness*, is capable of doing us? If so, we may live in constant dread and apprehension of every evil, and all the wretchedness which the most enthusiastic imagination can conjure from the darkness of a bewildered mind. This question must be settled. Is it a just and sufficient cause of fear, that God has *power* to do us *evil*? If it is, it is just as much and as good cause of *confidence and hope*, that he has *power* to do us *good*, and to elevate us above the reach of harm. Now, which of these results, will best comport with the character of a *perfect* being?

We like the argument used by Christ; premising, first, that it is evidence of consummate folly and petulance, to destroy, in the broad sense of the term, any thing of *value*. Christ reasons, on the occasion, with his disciples. He informs them, (6th and 7th verses) that a solitary sparrow, although a number of them could be bought for an insignificant sum, is not "*forgotten* before God."

What! damn and destroy utterly and everlastingly, his *offspring*, and not forget *sparrows*? Are sparrows worth more than human souls?

It would appear so, if modern opinions are admitted as evidence, and our eyes are closed against the light of reason and common sense. Let Christ speak. "Even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. *Fear not*, therefore, [wherefore? why] ye are of *more value* than many sparrows." Well, if God takes care of sparrows, so that not one of them is forgotten before him, he will take care of *me*, for the plain reason assigned by Christ; that I am of *more value* than a sparrow; or even many sparrows. We never knew the wise man, yet, who would be careful of *cents*, and squander away *dollars*.

What kind of a God do you worship, reader? Surely, a God who is able to kill, and to cast into hell; or he is not *Almighty*. A God who is willing to save, or he is not *good*. And a God who will prefer the saving to the destroying of every thing of value, or he is not *wise*.

Man is prone to fear his fellow. Strange as it may appear, it is a fact, that men generally fear their fellows more than their Maker. The declaration of Christ goes to correct this foolish fear, and to enlighten the understanding of men, that they may realize the goodness of God, and *fear not*. To be at rest; agreeably to the exhortation, "*Be still, [be quiet,] and know that I am God,*" There is no cause of fear. "*Rejoice evermore;*" says Paul. A prophet says, "*The Lord is my light and my salvation;*" and asks, "*Whom shall I fear?*" He adds, "*The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?*" *God is Love*. They who have the disposition to injure, have not the power; and God, who has the power, has not the disposition to harm his creatures. "*Fear not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.*"

CALVINISTIC ABSURDITIES.

We copy the following extract from the Gospel Advocate. The writer is a Calvinistic clergyman, who attempted to disprove the doctrine of God's impartial benevolence.

"We ask, therefore, if mankind could have their choice, what kind of a being would they choose to be governed by? If they could have their choice, would they not choose a God of *infinite power, of infinite knowledge, and who was unalterably determined to make them happy?* As they seek their own happiness, and cannot make themselves happy, and must depend upon God for it, would they not choose a God of infinite power, and knowledge, and who was unalterably determined to make them happy at all events? We are persuaded that it will be granted that men would make the above choice, had they it in their power.

"Well, Universalists say that God is of this character. Also they will own that men depend on God to make them happy.

"We ask then, is it possible for men to be displeased with such a God as this, if they knew him to be such? Certainly all men would love such a God as this, in their natural state. And this is further established by fact; for how much does the Universalist rejoice in his God, who he thinks to be of this character? Let it then be considered as a point that is established, both by reason and fact, that a God infinite in power and knowledge, and unalterably determined to make men happy at all events, must be pleasing to mankind, and that it is impossible but they will love such a God. Yea, we say, let these be considered as fixed principles that must stand, let the consequence be what it may; for surely they will stand, whether we allow it or not.

"We infer therefore, 1st, That the true character of God is according to the relish of all men."

"2d. We infer that all men are perfectly holy. A relish for the divine Being must be holiness. Had men the power of creating a God to suit them they would certainly create just such a God as this, and would love him after they had made him. This must be holiness.

"3d. We infer that men do naturally love God with all their heart;—and between God and the

creature there is no disagreement. Then we infer,

"4th. That there is also perfect obedience, for love is the fulfilling of the law. And the practice will correspond; for the heart governs the conduct. It is the fruit by which the tree is known. A man will not oppose his own heart. We infer,

"5th. That men do naturally love their neighbour as themselves. For, as the scripture represents, it is impossible to love God and hate our neighbour."

REMARKS.

The proposition which is scrutinized by the Calvinist, is true, or false. If true, the reverse of it is false. If false, the reverse of it is true. The Calvinist pretends to *love* a God, "*who is unalterably determined*" to make a part of mankind miserable. Does he love this God for this determination? If so, we confess, at once, that he is moved by *unnatural* feelings, and that *natural* men, (such as God made man,) must detest this principle. Does the Calvinist seek his own happiness or misery? If he seeks his own misery, he is a co-adjutor with the Devil. If he seeks his own happiness, then he is pursuing the same end with God, so far as himself is concerned. If God seeks the happiness of all men, the Calvinist must do the same, to be like God. If God seeks only the happiness of a part, he must do the same. We admit the fact, that Calvinists do not desire the happiness of *all* men. Call this natural or unnatural, here it is, and the Calvinist is opposed to universal good and happiness, and the advocate of endless and useless sin and misery.

It is a very easy matter to ascertain what kind of a God mankind love. Let it be admitted, that no man, in his senses, can love an undeserving object, and desire that which will make him miserable. A party who is the subject of deception may profess to do this. Do mankind love a God who is "*unalterably determined*" to make *all* men happy? No! Take all Christendom, and you will find nine-tenths of the mass of professing Christians, are at war with this sentiment, and profess to love and serve a God who is "*unalterably determined*" to make a part of mankind miserable. Will the Calvinist admit that nine-tenths of Christendom are converted and born again? Surely, this is a troublesome predicament for a Calvinist. The character of such a God, is according to the relish of *all* men. That is, a God who is "*unalterably determined*" to make all happy, and nine-tenths of mankind have *no relish* for him.

Alas! for error, how are its advocates blinded, and almost suffocated, as it were, with inconsistency and absurdity! Now we infer that *all* men are *not* perfectly holy. But, we must confess, that if the Calvinists' premises are true, they come very near it. They have no relish for a God of universal love. They are "*without natural affection.*"

To settle the principle beyond the possibility of mistake, the Calvinist says, "*Had men the power of creating a God to suit them, they would certainly create just such a God as this,*" &c. What kind of a God is this, who is spoken of? Ans. A God who

is "unalterably determined" to make all men alike happy. Is this the desire of mankind universally, the happiness of our neighbour, and that happiness as great as that enjoyed ourselves? Is this the desire of *wicked* men? Surely if there is any truth in the Calvinist's premises, wicked men are characterized by a desire of the happiness of all, not even excepting their greatest enemies; and good men, by a desire of misery for others. What kind of a God would the Calvinist make? A very cruel and partial one, we think, unless he were altered from his present views and feelings. The God who is pleasing to a Calvinist, is not the God who is "good to *all*, and whose *tender mercies* are over *all* his works." He does not love this God.

God be praised, the time is coming, when the blind eyes shall be opened, the deaf ears unstopped, when all shall see the salvation of God. At present, men call good evil and evil good. Man now hates his fellow, and endeavours to cloak his hatred by associating the abominable supposition that God also hates the object of his dislike; and that even his iniquity is holiness in God's sight. It is a truth, that the *devil* is the enemy of man's happiness. The devil shall be destroyed, and all his names and devices wherewith he has deceived and perplexed man, shall perish with him. Then, *love* shall be *universal*. Then, that infernal principle which works in the children of disobedience, and lures them to destruction, shall be exploded for ever.

THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

"God is King over all the earth."

In order to obtain a good understanding of the character of the Divine Being, as he is represented in the passage which heads this communication, it may be proper to set forth, in the first place, the character, manner, and conduct of a bad king, so that, by a comparison, we may be able to adjust consistent ideas of a good one.

That Pharaoh, king of Egypt, who opposed the Hebrews, when they were in his land, was a bad king. He was so cruel and hard-hearted, that he oppressed the Hebrews with heavy burdens, which were intolerable, under which they cried to heaven for deliverance. Nor were the burdens of labour, in which brick was demanded, but straw, which was necessary in the making of it, was denied, the most indicative of the hardness of his heart; for, with a design to keep the Hebrews few in number, that their increasing might not endanger his crown, he issued an edict, that all the male children of the Hebrews, should be put to death in infancy. Among the many wicked kings of Israel, Ahab may be mentioned. He wanted Naboth's vineyard for a garden of herbs; and because the owner refused to give up the inheritance of his fathers, this wicked, hard-hearted king was sorely vexed. But Jezebel, his queen, soon put him in possession of the coveted land, by having Naboth falsely accused and put to death. The life of this valuable citizen of Jezreel was wickedly and wantonly destroyed to gratify the pride and vanity of an ungodly tyrant. This was but an instance of the general conduct of ancient

tyrants, and it agrees well with the manner of kings, as described by Samuel in his first book, chap. viii. as follows: "And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, this will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your olive yards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king."

Among the prominent characteristics presented in the accounts to which we have referred, we discover absolute sovereignty, hardness of heart, such as cannot feel for the sufferings of others, and a covetousness which seeks to advance the glory of self, and that in a way, and by the use of means which disregarded the rights and privileges of others. In one word, a bad king glories in mischief, in cruelty, and in oppression in all its horrors.

The use which we design to make of the character of a bad king, is to direct us to form that of a good one. No candid person, of a good understanding, will allow that any of the foregoing characteristics belong to the Divine Being, who is said, in our text, to be king over all the earth; but it will be allowed that properties contrary to those, when duly combined, will form the true character of the Universal King. But here we pause. If we proceed in their way we shall prostrate the orthodox idol, as Dagon was humbled before the ark of the Lord; for there is not a single feature in the whole character of a bad king, which we have just noticed, that is not found in the idol of orthodoxy. This idol, his own worshippers contend is an absolute sovereign; and that he never does any thing because it is right, but that every thing which he does is right, because he does it. He brought us into this world totally depraved, entirely incapable of obeying his law; and yet he requires us, on pain of eternal damnation, to fulfil all its injunctions perfectly. All the cruelty and injustice which were manifested in Pharaoh's demanding brick and denying straw; is but a feeble comparison to represent the cruelty and injustice of this idol of orthodoxy, in demanding perfect obedience of us, when he has denied us any possible power by which we can obey, and in dooming us to everlasting torment for not performing impossibilities! Nor will the more perverse and cruel edict, which consigned the infant Hebrews to death, be found a stronger represen-

tation of the perverse and cruel doctrine which orthodoxy contends, sovereignty and for the glory of God, has consigned millions of infants, not to the waters of the Nile, but to a burning lake in the eternal world.

In the manner of a worldly tyrant, so well described by the prophet Samuel, we discover an absolute sovereignty, directed and acting for the sole purpose of promoting the vain glory of monarchy, by using subjects as slaves, and by disregarding their happiness and rights. And this most horrible picture we see glaringly portrayed in the face of the idol of orthodoxy. This idol seeks his own aggrandizement at the eternal expense of millions of souls, who are consigned to indescribable miseries for no other purpose. Nor is there any other argument in defence of this tyrant, than that God is a sovereign. This argument was in the mouth of Jezebel, the wife of Ahab. She comforted her husband, and encouraged him to hope for Naboth's vineyard, saying, "Dost thou not govern the kingdom of Israel?" If he governed the kingdom of Israel, of course, Naboth's life might be taken and his vineyard possessed by the king. So if God governs the kingdoms of the world, the inhabitants thereof may be sent to hell for ever, for his glory; and this cruelty will be vindicated by that woman Jezebel, who calls herself the church, whose whoredoms and witchcrafts are so many.

Leaving this horrible picture, let us contemplate the King over all the earth, free from all those characteristics which are seen in earthly despots. Here we behold our Father in heaven, who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. His laws, his ordinances, his providence, even his whole government, in all its branches, aim solely at the good of his subjects, who are all his children and heirs of his infinite wealth. He does nothing as a sovereign; but acts upon the most perfect principles of equity and goodness, governing the concerns of all his subjects in tenderness and mercy.

Let it be distinctly noticed that this God, whose tender mercies are over all His works, "is King over all the earth." He is to those nations and people, which we call heathen, what he is to us. He is their King and Father as well, as fully, as truly as he is ours.

What a strong delusion then is this popular doctrine, which teaches, that the king over all the earth has no love for the heathen, until we send missionaries and convert them to our creed! This egregious delusion has sent forth a host of beggars, which, like locusts, darken the air and devour every green thing; whose business is to obtain money from the hand of hard labour, and even from poverty itself, to defray the expenses of missionaries to go to foreign countries to convert the heathen to their creed, that the King of all the earth may not send them to hell! This swarm of beggars, like the vermin which plagued Egypt, enter into our houses and into our kneeling troughs, and would take the bread from our children's mouths! And what is all this for? It is to save the heathen from the wrath of this idol of orthodoxy. Under this idol's fury thou-

sands are now crying out, as Samuel told the people they would cry out because of their king. Mothers are crying out for fear this Moloch's wrath will fall on their children to all eternity! And such are the lamentations of our deluded idolaters, that they demonstrate that they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast.

Let those who worship the King of all the earth, in spirit and in truth, and who can happily realize that this universal King is a universal Father and Saviour, endeavour to enlighten our deceived fellow heirs of the divine favor, that they may have confidence in him "who will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." And may we all love and obey our Father, our King, our Judge, our Lawgiver, who will save us.

Bost. Univer. Mag.

From the Rochester Magazine.

EXTRACT FROM A SERMON ON THE TRINITY.

BY JOHN S. THOMPSON.

1. I shall lay before you a History of the Doctrine.

2. I shall examine its pretended evidences.

The word Trinity is derived from *tres*, three, and *unus*, one, and was formed or forged expressly for the purpose, to excite the incomprehensible, irrational, and most absurd idea of the THREE-ONE! Martin Luther says, "the word Trinity sounds very oddly, and is a human invention; it were better to call the Almighty, *God*, than Trinity." And John Calvin says, "I like not this prayer, O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity; it savours of barbarity. The word Trinity is barbarous, insipid, profane, a human invention, grounded on no testimony of God's word; the Popish God, unknown to the prophets and the apostles." See Ben Mordecai's Letters.

The first writer of antiquity who used the word Trinity, was Theophilus, about the year 180. However, the term, all barbarous as it was, had no such signification in the mouth of this writer, as that which the Holy Fathers, assembled in Council two hundred years after, determined it should bear. The controversies occasioned by Noetus, Praxeus, and Sabellius, about the end of the second century, were the cause of the term being adopted, to express a unity of substance and a plurality of persons. In this sense, the word was first used by Tertullian, in his discourse against Praxeus, about the year 200.

It is pretended by its advocates, that the Trinity is a great mystery which cannot be known or explained. If so why do they assert it to be a doctrine of Revelation? for whatever is revealed cannot be any longer a mystery. Musterion is derived from the Greek *muo*, or the Hebrew *Satar*, both of which signify to hide, shut, or conceal. A mystery is therefore something hid, concealed, covered or unrevealed; but as it is revealed, that moment it ceases to be a mystery. This is evident from the connexion and sense in which the word is almost invariably used in the New Testament. Matt. xiii. 11. Rom. xvi. 25. 26. 1 Cor. xv. 51. Col. i. 26.

From the most careful examination of all the passages where the word occurs, musterion never signifies any thing incomprehensible, but merely something that remains hidden, unrevealed, or unknown. Accordingly, Paul tells the Ephesians that God had made known the mystery of his will, by the dispensation which he had given to them; even that mystery which was hid for ages, but was now made manifest to the saints. Hence it follows, that the Trinity is not a Gospel mystery. Is it then of Greek or Roman origin, and can those initiated understand or explain it? No, they confess it is beyond their powers of comprehension. Why, then, talk about it, or mock your reason or understanding, by pretending to explain an inexplicable, or professing to believe ye know not what; for confessedly it remains a mystery?

This doctrine exhibits one of the greatest efforts to deceive and ridicule the rational faculties, ever suggested by human sophistry, in any age of the world. Though Bolingbroke and Ramsay both assert, that it entered the creeds of all the nations of antiquity; and enumerate the Egyptian, Pythagorean, Zoroastrian, Platonic, Chaldean, and Samothrasian Trinities; yet not one of these agrees with the modern hypothesis; for never did any heathen nation in the world acknowledge three self-existent, independent Gods; much less did they imagine these three to be one. Shall we admit that the doctrine of the Trinity is a tradition, delivered to the first parents of mankind, and by them handed down from father to son through all succeeding ages? Surely no such fanciful opinion should be admitted, or even repeated, seeing we have not the least intimation of it in the Jewish history; and the whole nation, as well as their Scriptures, abhor the dogma, as manifestly tending to contradict and dishonour the one Jehovah, and continue the reign of superstition and idolatry.

The first vestiges of a Trinity were discovered by the creative minds of Egyptian priests, those parents of hieroglyphical mysticism; and something similar appears in the worship of Osiris, Typhon, and Isis. Orpheus, who first transferred the doctrine from Egypt to Greece, taught the existence of a Divine Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus; the Persian Magi acknowledged an Oromasdes, Mithra and Arimanius. Plato, whose opinions were adulterated by Egyptian mysticisms during his travels, having personified the Divine Wisdom and Power, first taught that the Logos was an emanation from the Deity, and Divine Power another; and speaks of a Trinity, which he designates by the names of Agathos, Logos, and Psuche, or spirit of the world. But there never was any similar doctrine to that of the orthodox Trinity, consisting of three persons in one God, conceived, much less believed by any nation or people on earth.

From Macrobius and Plato, we learn, that the spiritualists held the world to be a machine which must have had a maker, whom they denominated Demi-ourgos. He must have acted from a plan, and consequently have had understanding, mens, or Logos which they called a second being. But

as they admitted a solar principle, or soul of the world, they were forced to give it a place in the Deity; and thence originated their Triad. This system was born a heretic in Egypt, was transmitted a heathen to the schools of Greece and Rome; and became Catholic and orthodox by the conversion of the followers of Pythagoras and Plato to the Christian religion.

The notion of Jehovah as a Father, may have first excited the inquiry, where is his son? An ignorant and proud philosopher is always forward to reply. This son they pronounced Nous or Logos, whom the Latins called Verbum, for 'Mens ex Deo nata,' says Macrobius; and the Anima mundi, was called the Holy Ghost. Who would ever have dreamed that orthodoxy, rather than want a Trinity, would have admitted a heathen Trinity, one of the persons being universally acknowledged to be the Devil? Without controversy, the Typhon of Egypt, the Siva of the Gentoos, the Arimanius of the Persians, and the Satan of the Jews, were names used to excite the same idea, and denote the destroyer! Moreover, one person of the ancient trinities was a female! Isis of Egypt, Mythra of Persia, the Diana of the Greeks, the Minerva of the Latins, and the Virgin Mary of the Catholics, have been similarly described, and have performed the same offices in the estimation of their deluded votaries. Indeed the orthodox view of the Deity, the Devil, and the Virgin, is perfectly harmonious with the sentiments of the ancient heathens concerning the Triad, or Tri-une Deity. Let the Joneses, Maurices, and Kidds, who seek to impose their Hindoo superstitions on the credulous, reflect on these things: and let them deny, if they are able, that the Hindoos did worship the Devil, as one person of their sacred Trinity. Let them also show if the Hindoos did not believe their Brama, Siva, and Vishnu, to be mere creatures produced by an eternal infinite, and immaterial being. Let them also deny it if they can, that the Persians did believe their Oromasdes, Arimanius, and Mythra, to be also the production of a God, who meditates all the management of the Universe: though at present he recline in happy repose. The whole system is Egyptian, transferred and taught by Orpheus in Europe about 1270 years before Christ, and by Zoroaster in Asia, near 600 years B. C.

As the Catholic Trinity is dissimilar from that of the Heathen, the fabricators of this chimerical paradox, must have been the Paganizing councils of the fourth century, who, baffled in their attempts to introduce their favourite dogmas into the Christian system, invented the curious labyrinth, at the threshold of which every one who entered, was obliged to renounce, for the remaining part of his life, all claims to common sense. If words directly opposed to each other, are allowed to be devoid of all sense, of what use could it be to us, to admit the doctrine as divine; clothed in words that have no possible meaning, and before which, according to the acknowledgment of its warmest advocates, the understanding of man must lie prostrate? Can any thing more effectually outrage common

sense, or be more abhorrent to reason, than that doctrine which requires us to believe a son to be as old as his father; derived from him, and yet independent of him, and self-existent? The spirit is derived from both father and son, and, notwithstanding, is himself the Lord and giver of life! Does not reason reel and stagger at the assertion, "there are three persons, each of whom is God, and yet not three Gods, but one God?" The Father gave away all his Deity to the Son, and yet he retained it whole and entire. Both Father and Son gave it fully to the Spirit, but were nothing diminished by the gift. Avaunt, ye mathematical axioms, and arithmetical calculations, so pernicious to Trinitarian tenets!

All the mysticism and burlesque metaphysics which orthodoxy has employed, to veil the airy fiction from exposure to ridicule and contempt, might have been pardoned; had not its crafty advocates hurled their anathemas against all who dared to remonstrate. But had all the philosophers of that age, in which this doctrine received its existence and obtained regal authority, been determined to expose the religion of Jesus to contempt and ridicule, I know not how they could have better effected their end, than by the curious invention of this mystical and unintelligible labyrinth of absurdity! "A little jargon, says Gregory Nazianzen to St. Jerome, is all that is necessary to impose on the people; the less they comprehend, the more they admire! Our forefathers have said not what they thought, but what circumstances dictate!" See Hieron. ad Nep.

All amusing though it be, yet it is a certain fact, that the fathers assembled at Antioch, A. D. 270, reprobated the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, and hurled their fiery bolts, at the devoted head of the famous Paul of Samosata.

But, not long after, another more formidable enemy, namely, Arius, attacked their sacred citadel, from an opposite quarter. Sabellius, an Egyptian philosopher, having excited a considerable contest in Africa, by asserting the unity of the Father and the Son, and Alexander having affirmed, with equal boldness, the eternity of the Son, Arius, provoked at their extravagancies, asserted that Christ was made out of nothing. To settle this dispute, Constantine called the Council of Nice, which first began the work of metamorphosing the Deity into a shapeless monster!

The holy fathers, at the call of Constantine, ascended in clouds to Nice, and there without reflecting on what had been done, at a quondam assembly, earnestly hastened, not to imitate their master, by pronouncing a blessing on their adversaries, but to thunder alike their horrid imprecations on Arius and the former council, and assert the consubstantiality of Father and Son. As yet they had not discovered the third person of the Trinity, and consequently the doctrine was in embryo, even in the fourth century! The council of Nice, says Mr. Soverain, did not at all touch upon the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Far from it. The Holy Ghost was so little considered at that time, that some fathers of

the council, would have made no difficulty, to give the superiority to the Virgin Mary, in making her the third person in the Trinity. This appears from Mahomet taking Mary for the third person of the Trinity. Anselm advises to trust Mary rather than Jesus her son. See Claude's Essay on a sermon, and Sale's Koran.

But that the reader may have a just notion of this Council, let it be observed, out of nearly two thousand Bishops, only 318 could be induced to act; and even these were partially compelled by the Emperor! It will be easy to form an idea of the manner of doing business at this Council, when we consider that the poor bishops, the greater part of whom were incapable of writing their own names, could no otherwise distinguish the true Gospels from a multitude of spurious books, than by placing them under the altar, and then betaking themselves to prayer, that God might cause the true books to rise, and place themselves on the altar, which, it is pretended, miraculously happened. See Dodwell's Notes on Ireneus.

Notwithstanding Constantine had the principal hand in the decisions of the Council, yet he soon repented of his orthodoxy, banished the famous Athanasius to Treves, recalled Arius, and died an Arian. Moreover, the Council at Jerusalem received Arius, and Constantius, abetting the dying sentiments of his father, established Arianism as the religion of his empire.

As yet, the pangs were premature; the time for parturition of the man of sin, was not fully come. No doctrine had yet been established, by any council, even three hundred and fifty years after Christ, which would not at this day, be called Arian heresy. Hence Petavius, the Jesuite, and many learned men, have not hesitated to assert, that the church was Socinian or Arian, till the Council of Nice. Nor was it till the year 363, when the church was nearly divided between the followers of Arius and Sabellius, that Athanasius began to publish, with some degree of approbation, the doctrine of the Spirit, which he had just invented.

But this novel opinion having obtained a party, he and his associates at the call of Theodosius the Great, held the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381, which, not content with two Gods, condemned the opinions of Macedonius, added the Holy Ghost to the other two, saying he proceeded from the Father and Son, and ought to be adored with them. Thus was completed, the monstrous doctrine of the distinct personality and consubstantiality of the Father, Son, and Spirit; or the mysterious Trinity! (*Concluded in our next.*)

From the (Ohio) Intelligencer and Advertiser.

Mr. CAMRON—I have in the 67th No. of the Intelligencer, asked twenty queries of the christian world and have not received satisfactory answers. If you will please to insert these combining facts which I submit to Trinitarians, you will oblige your friend.

1st. There are in the Old Testament about 2000 passages, and in the New about 1000, in which the

unity of God is either positively expressed or plainly implied. On the other hand, there is but one text in the whole Bible which contains any thing like a formal statement of the Trinity; and that text is allowed by Trinitarian scholars to be an interpolation. 1 John v. 7, 8.

2d. There are in the New Testament 240 passages wherein Christ is declared to be inferior to the Father. The expressions relating to this point are clear and incapable of any other sense, without violence and distortion. On the other hand, there is only the *sound* of one text which seems to set forth Christ's equality with the Father, and the sound is entirely owing to a mistranslation. (Philippians ii. 6.)

3d. There are in the New Testament 441 passages wherein God the Father is styled the *one* and *only* God, or God absolutely, by way of pre-eminence and supremacy, or God with some peculiar high titles, epithets, or attributes.

On the contrary, in the estimation of the most rigid orthodox believers, there are no more than eleven passages in which the Lord Jesus Christ is styled God.

Of these eleven, the word God, is allowed by all, to be interpolated in two places, and it is therefore printed in italics, to shew that it is wanting in the original. (Acts vii. 57. 1 John iii. 16.) Two others are proven by Trinitarian critics themselves, to be mistranslated. (Acts xx. 28. 1 Tim. iii. 10.) Others are quotations from the Old Testament, in which the same words are in the one case applied to the son of Isaiah, in the other, to Solomon, and therefore prove their deity as much as that of Christ. * * * i. 23, quoted from Isa. v. 14, and Heb. i. 9, quoted from Psalm xlv. 6. Two others, when compared with the context, seems to me evidently to refer, not to Christ, but to Almighty God. Titus ii. 13. 1 John v. 20.

Of the remaining three texts, our learned men think one a mistranslation, though in this their learned opponents in general do not agree. Rom. ix. 5. Another is the exclamation of the incredulous and astonished Thomas, when convinced that Christ was raised from the dead, John xx. 23, and the remainder text, John i. 1, in which it is said that "the word was God," is easily explained, when it is considered that in the Scriptures all are called gods to whom the word of God came.

4th. Christ is called in scripture, forty-six times *man*, and forty-two times, the son of man: How is he the son of man, if man was not his father?

Come, my friends, and examine these four facts; they speak for themselves: they tell thee, that if thou wishest to weigh the evidence on both sides of the question, thou must take the balance of impartiality. In the first place, thou must put in the one scale 3000 texts with reason on their side, in the other, an interpolation, lighter than air! Next, thou must put in the scale 240 passages which assert the inferiority of Christ: against them, the sound of a passage which seems to teach his equality to the Father. Lastly, thou must weigh 441 texts against 11, of which 4 are acknowledged interpolations and

mistranslations! View, also, the 46 times in which the Saviour is called man; and the 42 times in which he is called the Son of man, and say, does it require the light of learning, or the keen eye of criticism to see on which side the balance will preponderate?

W. D. J.

A CONFESSION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,

Which was made at Constantinople, in the year 1585, by one who being complained of as a great heretic, gave this answer and reason of his faith, to some Latin and Greek Christians, as also to several Jews and Turks that were present.

We believe that there is One first of all things—which comprehends them all—which cannot be comprehended of any. That there is one Cause and one Essence of all things that have a being; one Supreme Good, which we call God—whom we know in this Mind, and honour in Speech: showing, by Goodness and well doing, that we are the Children of our Father, the Supreme Good.

We believe in one Jesus Christ, who is the Perfect Example and Pattern of the Children of God—whom we are to follow in patient Suffering of the Creature, and in Love to our Neighbour, and so become Temples of his Spirit—where the only Divine Worship which is acceptable to God, the highest God, is well-doing.

We believe also in the Holy Ghost, when we feel the operative Power of this highest good in ourselves. We are all in the Communion of Christ, and they who enjoy this Communion, are born again into this Power, and thereby deified, being raised above Nature to a State of Incorruption and Immortality, and by this means, become Instruments of the endless Glory of God.

Without holding these things none can have a true or right Faith.

Question. Why were you born?

Answer. For God's good Will.

Q. For what end were you born?

A. For the Glory of God.

Q. What is your Religion?

A. Well-doing.

Q. What is your Profession?

A. Our own Nothingness.

Q. What is your Comfort?

A. God's Almightiness.

Q. What is your Prayer?

A. To be resigned and Will-less.

Q. What is your Life?

A. God's Goodness.

Q. What is your Death?

A. A translation into the Glory of God.

Q. What do you hold amongst so many Religions as are in the world?

A. We believe of God in Goodness; we think of our Neighbour in Love, and meanly of ourselves.

Q. Are you Baptized?

A. Yes; and are yet willing to be Baptized.

Q. Wherewithal?

A. With water, which the moving of the Spirit of God drives from our hearts, through our eyes,

and incorporates in his Love, at times, when it seems good unto him.

Q. Do you celebrate the Lord's Supper?

A. Yes; many times and oft.

Q. In what Church or Communion?

A. In the Church or Communion of God.

Q. What do you hold of Christ's Body—what is his Flesh and Blood?

A. Christ's Flesh is a constant enduring Patience, and his Blood is a Divine, operative, living Love; where this Flesh is possessed in patience, and where this Blood lives in Love, there is the true Communion of the true Body of Jesus Christ. This suffering Flesh and this loving Blood of Christ, makes us Children of God, and by means thereof we have Communion with the Son of God—the substance and good Nature of God comes into us, and that cannot be without a Transubstantiation, or a Change and Destruction of our Evil Nature.

Q. Have you no other Sacraments or Ceremonies than these?

A. The forementioned we will very willingly Observe and Celebrate with you, and what other may be besides these, we will wholly leave to yourselves for to avoid Disputes. And so I take my leave of you.

London—Printed 1711. }

Philadelphia—Reprinted 1793. }

From the French of Massillon.

THE WORLD.

What is the world even to those who love it, who are intoxicated with its pleasures, and who cannot live without it? The world! it is a perpetual servitude, where no one lives for himself alone, and where, if we strive to be happy, we must kiss its fetters and love its bondage. The world! it is a daily revolution of events, which create in succession, in the minds of its partizans, the most violent passions, bitter hatreds, odious perplexities, devouring jealousies, and grievous chagrins. The world! it is a place of malediction, where pleasures themselves carry with them their troubles and afflictions. In the world there is nothing lasting—nor fortunes the most affluent—nor friendships the most sincere—nor characters the most exalted—nor favours the most enviable. Men pass their lives in agitations, projects, and schemes: always ready to deceive, or trying to avoid deception; always eager and active to profit by the retirement, disgrace, or death of their competitors; always occupied with their fears or hopes; always discontented with the present, and anxious about the future, never tranquil, doing every thing for repose, and removing still farther from it.

Vanity, ambition, vengeance, luxury, avarice—these are the virtues which the world knows and esteems. In the world, integrity passes for simplicity; duplicity and dissimulation are meritorious. Interest, the most vile, arms brother against brother, friend against friend—and breaks all the ties of blood and friendship; and it is this base motive which produce our hatreds and attachments! The wants and misfortunes of a neighbour, find only indifference and insensibility, when we can neglect

him without loss, or cannot be recompensed for our assistance.

If we could look into two different parts of the world—if we could enter into the secret detail of anxieties and inquietudes—if we could pierce the outward appearance, which offers to our eyes only joy, pleasure, pomp, and magnificence; how different should we find it from what it appears! We should see it destitute of happiness—the father at variance with his child—the husband with his wife; and the antipathies, the jealousies, the murmurs, and the eternal dissension of families. We should see friendships broken by suspicions, by interests, by caprices; unions, the most endearing, dissolved by inconsistency; relations the most tender, destroyed by hatred and perfidy; fortunes the most affluent, producing more vexation than happiness; places the most honourable, not giving satisfaction, but creating desires for higher advancement; each one complaining of his lot, and the most elevated not most happy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Dear Sir—I must confess, for one of your readers, that I am heartily tired of your controversy with the Rev. Mr. Woodworth; and I also think that many of your pages which have been appropriated to controversial matter, might have been occupied with subjects more interesting, or more entertaining. I confess also, that I think Mr. Woodworth a skilful leader, at least an ingenious one, would he had a better cause to maintain; but I do not think that your ranks are much thinned by the thundering artillery of his eloquence; or that your powerful arguments have made any very great impression on his followers; for, let it be remembered, that deep-rooted religious prejudices are not so easily removed, and after all, (like Goldsmith's schoolmaster)

"E'en though vanquish'd he will argue still."

I would therefore advise you both to agree to a cessation of arms, draw off your forces, and take breath at least for a while. U.

New-York, April 13, 1824.

Note—Our correspondent is pretty candid. ED.

HOLY WAR.

It appears some of the clergymen in this city are engaged in a mighty dispute about the funds of the state of New-York; which are appropriated by the Legislature to the support of Free Schools. The present condition of two of these gentlemen is rather novel. It seems they have branded the declaration of a gentleman concerned, as a falsehood, and published it to the world. The gentleman, conceiving himself injured, has resorted to the press, and supported the truth of his assertion, relative to the part acted by the clergymen, by adducing the evidence of six men of respectability and veracity. Thus the falsehood, which was "up to the highest bidder," is "knocked off" to the *priesthood*!

We will not refrain from expressing an opinion, that it is matter for regret, that the orthodox clergy are so captious, and quick for a noise or quarrel. It would comport better with their profession, if they were to leave wrangling and disputing to sinners.

Gospel Herald.

"FEAR NOT; FOR BEHOLD, I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY, WHICH SHALL BE TO ALL PEOPLE."

BY THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW-YORK. EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1824.

NO. 52.

From the Rochester Magazine.

EXTRACT FROM A SERMON ON THE TRINITY.

BY JOHN S. THOMPSON.

(Concluded from page 406.)

TEXT—1 JOHN V. 7.

That Athanasius invented the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost, and was consequently the Father of the Trinitarian heresy, has been fully attested by Gregory Nazianzen in his twenty-first Oration. "When many, says he, were unsound in the faith concerning the Son, many more concerning the Spirit, and very few sound in both articles; Athanasius was moved to assert of the Spirit, what others had done of the Son." The fact has been demonstrated by professor Whiston in his letters to Lord Nottingham, which none can read without admitting that the famous Hero of Trinitarianism was the founder of the system, whether he composed the creed that bears his name or not. Even at that time the doctrine was not tamely received; for the Latin Churches could not bear the absurd and antisciptural jargon. Hence we find Hieronymus exclaiming, "What sacriligious mouth can utter it, or dare to preach three persons or substances!" And Facundus Hermianensis L. 1. p. 8, assures us the church would never have distinguished the Father, Son, and Spirit by the name of persons, had she not been pressed by the Sabellians.

During the fourth century, no less than forty-five councils were convened, for the sole purpose of manufacturing creeds, and transmitting the shackles of slavery and superstition to posterity. Out of these, thirteen asserted the doctrine of Christ's Deity; fifteen determined on behalf of Arius; and seventeen concluded in favour of Semi-Arianism, that Christ was an Angelic being. What opinion can we form from these jarring, and self-contradictory assemblies? Shall we say with St. Augustine, that posterior councils corrected the mistakes of the ancient? Or with Cardinal de Cusa, the Church by changing her opinions, obliges us to believe that God changes his!

"I have just read, says John Wesley, in one of his Journals, Mr. Baxter's History of the councils; it is utterly astonishing, and would be altogether incredible, were not his vouchers beyond all exception. What a company of execrable wretches have they been! For one cannot give them a better name; who, in every age since that of St. Cyprian, have taken upon them to govern the Church. How has one council been perpetually cursing another, and delivering all to Satan, whether predecessors or contemporaries, who did not implicitly receive their de-

terminations: though generally trifling, sometimes false, and frequently unintelligible and self-contradictory! Surely Mahometanism was let loose to reform the Christians, and I know not but Constantinople has gained by the change!"

Hilary, in his letter to the Emperor Constantius, L. 2, C. 4, acknowledges that "it was a thing equally deplorable and dangerous, that there were as many creeds as opinions among men; as many doctrines as inclinations; and as many sources of blasphemy as there were faults among them; because they made creeds arbitrarily and explained them as arbitrarily! The Homo-ousion or consubstantiality is rejected and received, and then explained away by successive Synods. The partial or total resemblance of the Father and Son, is a subject of dispute for these unhappy times! Every year, nay, every moon we make new creeds to describe *invisible mysteries*! We repent of what we have done: we anathematize those whom we defend! We condemn either the doctrine of others in ourselves, or our own in that of others. We tear each other to pieces, and cause each other's ruin!" Locke's Common Place Book.

The learned Turretine, de variis Chr. Relig. fatiis, observes that "the Emperor Constantine, being led to the faith, the pomp of empire ruined the church: for though the heathen were converted to Christ, his religion was degraded to heathenism!" "Let me be bold to assert, says Edwards, in his *Patrologia*, p. 135, that we should have understood the Scriptures much better, if we had not had the writings of the Fathers: for they obscured and depraved them by their different and contradictory comments." Jeffery on Phil. i. 10, remarks, that "as learning came into the Church, systems of Christianity were multiplied, and every point of doctrine disputed, opposed, and defended, till few were able to distinguish what was human from what was divine; and still fewer dared to acknowledge their own opinion. At length the people found it so difficult to understand what the learned had made unintelligible to themselves, that *despairing of knowledge they acquiesced in ignorance*!"

Bishop Sherlock concludes his Sermon on Jude iii. in the following manner: "From these arguments it is evident, that the apostles, who were witnesses and teachers of the faith, had no authority to add to the doctrine of Christ, or declare any new article of belief. Now if the apostles commissioned directly by Christ, and supported by the miraculous gifts of the spirit, had not this power, can any of their successors pretend to it without great impiety? Did bishops of the fourth or tenth century know

the articles of faith better than the apostles? Whence then the pretended power of Churches to make new articles of faith, and doom all to eternal destruction who cannot receive them? Can any serious Christian trust himself to such guides?" Let all such pretended authorities, read the awful denunciations of Paul and Christ; though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other doctrine, let him be accursed! I testify to every man, that whosoever adds to the words of the book of this prophecy, God will add to him the plagues written in this book.

Such, my audience, is the history of the Trinity; let us now briefly consider its consequences, idolatry and superstition.

The religion of Jesus being at the close of the fourth century, completely adjusted to the heathen theogony, superstition began to march with rapid strides. The lying wonders and pious frauds having commenced, the wood of the sacred Cross was easily discovered; and the reign of the beast began, whose mark was the initial letters of the three following words—*Christou Xulon Staurou, the wood of the cross of Christ!* Rev. xiii. 18. Nor was it long after till the consecrated wood, discovered by Helen the mother of Constantine, was held in as high estimation as the Saviour himself. The gate to idolatry being opened, the debased church of Christ soon sunk into the most deplorable ignorance and barbarism: and by the canonization of her saints, soon began to rival any of the Pagan nations in the number of her deities and objects of adoration! According to the description given of the cathedral at Rome, by Dr. Middleton, it can be called nothing, even at the present time, but the Roman Pantheon modernized! O, ye Trinitarians, show me the nation of ancient or modern times, which has worshipped a multitude of gods without debasing itself with the horrors of superstition!

From age to age, in her abhorr'd control,
Blind superstition held the human soul;
In her long course of vengeance and of guilt,
Her hands still reeking with the blood she spilt,
While history trembled as she penn'd the deeds,
Dared for her unintelligible creeds;
As on the altar, which her hands had rais'd,
The victim suffer'd, and the fagot blaz'd.

In the beginning of the fourth century, christianity being received by Constantine, obtained the protection of civil power: and from this unnatural union, the most terrible effects rapidly ensued. Councils of ecclesiastics convened by Emperors, soon formed motley creeds and piled on them numerous additions. From the time the doctrine of the Trinity was established by law, the Imperial sceptre shifted like a shadow, from hand to hand: and the state religion modelled according to state policy, by the glorious aid of penal edicts, fines, imprisonments, and executions, arrived finally to the present system of orthodoxy. Here let us date the commencement of the reign of the Apocalyptic beast: and from the fifth to the fifteenth century, the powers of anti-Christian darkness enjoyed their millenium. Idolatry is a crime of which all detest

the name; yet it awfully grows on superstitious persons, by insensible degrees. Idolatry, originated in the worship of beings, who were supposed mediators or benefactors of mankind. The Jews, to whom God had given the most express command, never to represent him by any likeness or similitude, fell away insensibly by degrees till they worshipped the calves set up by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel. From them they proceeded in degradation till at length they worshipped the gods of the nations, whom the Lord had driven out from before them; and carried this impiety to such a climax, as to burn their children in the fire to horrid Moloch! Like the Jews and Pagans, Christians first began to revere their departed zealots, preserve relicts of martyrs, and then finally they proceeded to worship alike Jesus, his cross, and as many of his followers as they were pleased to dignify by the imposing appellation of saints. But as it fared with the Jews and heathen, so it soon occurred to the nominal Christians, God gave them up to a reprobate sense! O, Father of lights, shine into their hearts; lighten their darkness, that they may be converted!

The Divine Unity, is a doctrine written, as with sunbeams, on the eternal heavens, inscribed on the shining stars and revolving planets; and is alike the conclusion of the philosopher and the opinion of the peasant. Nothing but the basest superstition could ever have effaced this sentiment from the human mind. Being an eternal truth founded on the nature and reason of things, it must ever be the deduction of unperverted minds. For if God be possessed of all possible perfections, in an infinite degree, all other gods must be useless, or rather, the very supposition of their existence is absurd. Their existence, if possible, would only tend to disturb, pervert, or overturn the order and harmony of the universe.

What more could be necessary for the formation and government of infinite space, filled with worlds, than infinite power and infinite wisdom, universally diffused throughout that infinite space? Can infinite space itself, admit more than one infinite Deity? And can that Deity enclose, in his very nature, any other being, that is not subordinate and limited, seeing such a one must be entirely under the influence of his control, and shut up in his unbounded grasp? One infinite Jehovah is sufficient; more would be unnecessary; they cannot exist; infinite space could not contain them. The Universe, filled with an omnipresent, Almighty God, is mathematically equal to a universe full with Almighty Gods. Where then is there room for the Trinity? This doctrine is equally abhorred by the testimony of Scripture. Open the book of the law, What saith it? I, Jehovah, am your God. Thou shalt have no other. Consult the Prophets. Jehovah by them, declares there is no other God: I know not any. Hear Jesus himself. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; Him only shalt thou serve. This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God. Ask the Apostles. They also tell you, To us there is but one God, even the Father. In one word, from the first communications of the Deity, till the whole

volume of revelation was sealed, the uniform language of God's messengers has been, Jehovah the Creator of the universe, is **ONE**; there is no other God but **HE**.

Go, hearers, if you love the monster Trinity, you will not object to his legitimate offspring. If not, despise that which is so repugnant to reason, affrontive to human intellect, and dishonourable to God. Shun, shun those men, who under pretence of explaining the revelation of Heaven, sow in the hearts of their fellow men, the most dispiriting and unchristian doctrines! Retreat from the unthinking multitude; seek the paths of virtue and sense, and hearken to the voice of Divine wisdom; so shall your God approve your conduct.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Mr. Fitz,

Dear Sir—Having been for two years a subscriber to the Gospel Herald, and having had access to the 1st and 2d volumes, I there see you an indefatigable defender of Trinitarianism; or the exclusive divinity of Jesus Christ. Your answer to Friend Sharman, (a bold Trinitarian) to me appeared conclusive argument, to prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ; but to several of your subscribers, you appear of late, to assume (camelion like) different colours. Now it is no disgrace nor crime for a man to change his sentiments, provided he does it conscientiously; but let a man be honest and candid, uncaring of consequences. Let him undeceive his readers and the public. This is what I want Brother Fitz to do; if he be of the same mind as he was, when he said that Neighbour Sharman would make a very good Jew, but would not do for a Christian, let him say so; if he has changed sides, let him attempt to disprove what he has so long and in so able a manner fully proved, at least to my satisfaction. I briefly refer Brother Fitz to his own argument with Friend Sharman; and subscribe myself his Brother in the faith of Abraham.

A SUBSCRIBER.

ANSWER.

When this work was commenced, it was commenced with the sole view and purpose of disseminating *truth*, and exposing *error*. It is admitted by all, that, in this mode of being, mankind are imperfect, and their minds circumscribed to a partial knowledge of the being, character, and purposes of God. The great diversity of opinion relative to the question, "*What is truth?*" is incontestable evidence of man's present imperfection. It would be evidence of a lamentable arrogance in any man, to present himself as infallible, and demand of his fellows an unconditional and unlimited subservience to his views, and acquiescence in his opinions. A publication such as the Gospel Herald, is admitted to be a source of information, a mean of mental improvement. But a paper which is devoted to the dissemination of particular sentiments, to the exclusion of candid examinations of the sentiments propagated, cannot advance the interest of mankind. The Scriptures, stripped of false glosses, interpolations, &c. may be considered infallible. The opinions

of men, are necessarily considered in reference to the Scriptures, they being the standard by which to test the truth of every thing advanced. Therefore, the doctrine taught by the inspired writers, when understood, will have a preference, in a candid and honest mind, over the doctrines of men possessing inferior qualifications. The object then, is, to learn the truth. The means, are the mental faculties which God has given us; and we can arrive at the truth only with God's assistance. If we have propagated error only; and have sincerely endeavoured to propagate truth, it is our misfortune, not our fault. But we rejoice that we have not to lament this result. If we have made no advances in knowledge, we think it will appear evident, that we have been unprofitable servants; unless we resort to the alternative of declaring, that we were perfect in wisdom at the onset. We commenced this publication in the belief that "God is the Saviour of *all* men." We have increased in this faith, rather than diminished. Our First Volume contains our decided rejection of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and many arguments to show its absurdity. We have progressed in this view, and now believe, as we then believed, that the *tripersonality* of God, as taught by those claiming for themselves the appellation of orthodox, is a gross error.

The Christian world, so called, has been distracted with various and contending opinions relative to the person of Jesus Christ. Ages have witnessed the contending parties, and the *blood* of numerous victims has cried from the ground, and condemned the *spirit* of the pretended followers of the Lamb-like Saviour. In common with most men of the present day, the editor of this paper was educated in the belief of the doctrine of the Trinity, and taught that *three* persons were concerned and operatively engaged in the creation, redemption, and damnation of man. His reason was necessarily laid aside as useless; being told that the doctrine was above reason. His affections, common to the nature God gave him, were condemned, as being opposed to God's justice. He was left to combat with his fears, and these were nursed with constant threats of endless wretchedness, if the incomprehensible doctrine which outraged reason, was not believed; if the cruel doctrine which warred with the best feelings of his nature, was not loved; if the most unjust decrees were not pronounced merciful and good. This is a brief and faint outline of the debut which the human mind has been compelled to make upon the stage of modern theology. The God of heaven, (or happiness) has been forsaken, and a tri-coloured monster worshipped in his stead.

It has been the design of the editor of this paper, to direct the minds of men to the Scriptures, instead of the traditions of men. To represent God as the Universal Father and friend of man. Not to represent himself as infallible, and threaten men with misery in another world, if they refused to acknowledge his opinions and principles. Of Jesus Christ we have uniformly taught and believed; that his mission was divine. "The Father sent the Son the Saviour of the world." (1 John iv. 14.) "God

was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." (2 Cor. v. 18.) We believe Jesus Christ to be pre-eminently distinguished, and to have a name which is "*above every name.*" (Phil. ii. 9.) We believe it to be our duty, and we bow to the authority of the Scriptures, according to the understanding which God is pleased to give us. We readily acknowledge, that we do not now understand the declaration "I and the Father are *one*," as we once did. But we believe in no God but the God who "was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. The God who was *in Christ*, we understand to be the Father of Jesus Christ, and Christ to be his Son. Whenever we have taught a different doctrine from this, we have taught it in sincerity. We teach what we believe to be truth, and offer to others the doctrine we cherish ourselves. If our readers discover new views, let them receive nothing of us, but of God; testing every thing that is offered them by God's revelation, and looking unto him as the only perfect Teacher.

The editor of this paper feels himself dependent upon God alone. Whatever may be his views, honestly entertained, and patiently investigated, he will risk the publishing of them; for he has no private end to obtain; and no considerations of a pecuniary kind, to make him turn to the right hand or to the left. It is all the same to him, whether praised or blamed, so far as his motives are in question. He has no party to serve, and nothing to expect as an equivalent for the faithful discharge of his duty.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

EPISCOPALIAN VIEWS OF THE TRINITY.

1st. The most rational view of the Trinity, is that held by Dr. Wallis, which in its day met with the decided approbation of the university of Oxford; namely: That it is a silly mistake that a divine person is as much, as to say a Divinity or God, when indeed it is only a mode or relation of God to his creatures. That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are no more *three* distinct intelligent persons, than the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, are *three* Gods.

2d. Dr. Sherlock and his partisans assert, that the *three* persons of the trinity are as much *three* distinct infinite minds, as Peter, James, and John, are *three* men.

3d. The Athanasian party believe, that the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty, and yet there are not *three* Almightys, but *one* Almighty.

4. Dr. Burnet, and his followers maintain, that the Son and the Holy Ghost are created beings, and are gods, only by the indwelling of the Father's Godhead.

5th. Bishop Horsely, and his admirers contend, that the Father produced the Son by contemplating his own perfections; that the existence of the Son flows necessarily from the divine intellect exerted on itself.

6th. Bishop Gastrell and Dr. Moysey's system, is, that the Father includes the whole idea of God, and

something more; that the Son includes the whole idea of God, and something more, and that the Holy Ghost includes the whole idea of God, and something more; while altogether, they make up one complete God, and *nothing* more!

7th. Bishop Burgess and his adherents, are directly opposed to Dr. Moysey. The Bishop says, that the Father is a *person*, but not a *being*; the Son is a *person*, but not a *being*; and the Holy Ghost is a *person*, but not a *being*; and that these *three* personal non-entities make one perfect being!

8th. Mr. Heber, in his Bampton Lectures, maintains the extraordinary position, that the Father is the *first* person in the Trinity, the archangel Michael the second, and the angel Gabriel the third. In Lecture No. 4, he assures us, that the Mahometan Doctors all understand the angel Gabriel to mean the Holy Ghost. Their authority, no doubt, is very great! Burns, the Scottish poet, hath well said—"Of all nonsense, religious nonsense is the most nonsensical."

Leaving Right Reverend Bishops, and Reverend Doctors, let us hear what the Scriptures say on this subject. Our Lord addressing his Father and our Father, his God and our God, declares, John xvii. 3. "This is life eternal, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Christ, speaking of the day of judgment, uses these remarkable words; Mark xiii. 32. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." He also says, "Of my own self I can do nothing. My Father is greater than I," &c. St. Paul likewise bears testimony to the doctrine of the *unity* and supremacy of God the Father. 1 Cor. viii. 6. "To us *there is but one* God the Father." Ephes. iv. 4-6. "*There is one* body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." These passages require no comment. They declare the truth, that the *one* God, who is above all, is the Father; in these very words. He, therefore, who derides or denies this doctrine, derides or denies the Scriptures of truth. J. L.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Extract from a Speech delivered at an aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics of Cork, by CHARLES PHILLIPS, the celebrated Irish Orator.

"This hostility of her sects has been the disgrace, the peculiar disgrace of Christianity. The Gentoo loves his cast, so does the Mahometan, so does the Hindoo, whom England, out of the abundance of her charity is about to teach her creed; I hope she may not teach her practice. But Christianity, Christianity alone exhibits her thousand sects, each denouncing his neighbour here, in the name of God, and damning hereafter out of pure devotion!—"You're a heretic," says the Catholic; "You're a Papist," says the Protestant; "I appeal to Saint Peter," exclaims the Catholic; "I appeal to Saint Athanasius," cries the Protestant; "and if it goes to damning, he's as good as any saint in the calen-

dar." "You'll be damned eternally," moans out the Methodist; "I'm the elect!" Thus it is, you see, each has his anathema, his accusation and his retort, and in the end Religion is the victim! The victory of each is the overthrow of all; and infidelity, laughing at the contest, writes the refutation of their creed in the blood of their combatants! I wonder if this reflection has ever struck any of those reverend dignitaries who rear their mitres against Catholic emancipation. Has it ever glanced across their Christian zeal, if the story of our country should have casually reached the valleys of Hindostan, with what an argument they are furnishing the heathen world against their sacred missionary? In what terms could the Christian ecclesiastic answer the Eastern Bramin, when he replied to his exhortation in language such as this? "Father, we have heard your doctrine: it is splendid in theory, specious in promise, sublime in prospect; like the world to which it leads, it is rich in the miracles of light. But, Father, we have heard that there are times when its rays vanish and leave your sphere in darkness, or when your only lustre arises from the meteors of fire, and moons of blood: we have heard of the verdant island which the spirit of God has raised in the bosom of the waters with such a bloom of beauty, that the very wave she has usurped, worships the loveliness of her intrusion. The sovereign of our forests is not more generous in his anger than her sons; the snow-flake, ere it falls on the mountain, is not more pure than her daughters; little inland seas reflect the splendours of her landscape, and her valleys smile at the story of the serpent! Father, it is true that this isle of the sun, this people of the morning, find the fury of the ocean in your creed, and more than the venom of the viper in your policy. It is true, that for six hundred years, her peasant has not tasted peace, nor her piety rested from persecution. Oh! Brama, defend us from the God of the Christian! Father, father, return to your brethren, retrace the waters; we may live in ignorance, but we live in love, and we will not taste the tree that gives us evil when it gives us wisdom. The heart is our guide, nature is our gospel; in the imitation of our fathers we found our hope, and, if we err, on the virtue of our motives we rely for redemption." How would the missionaries of the mitre answer him? How will they answer that insulted Being of whose creed their conduct carries the refutation? But to what end do I argue with the BIGOT? A wretch, whom no philosophy can humanize, nor charity soften, nor religion reclaim; no miracle convert; a monster, who, red with the fires of hell, and bending under the crimes of earth, erects his murderous divinity upon a throne of skulls, and would gladly feed, even with a brother's blood, the cannibal appetite of his rejected altar! His very interests cannot soften him into humanity. Surely, if it could, no man would be found mad enough to advocate a system which cankers the very heart of society, and undermines the natural resources of government; which takes away the strongest excitement to industry, by closing up every avenue to laudable ambition; which admin-

isters to the vanity or vice of a party, when it should only study the advantage of a people; and holds out the perquisites of state as an impious bounty on the persecution of religion."

From the (Portland) Christian Intelligencer.

EXTRACTS AND REMARKS.

Mr. Editor—My neighbours of the *Hopkinsian* persuasion, are very much alarmed on my account, and take all methods to show me, except those which would be likely to convince a rational person, that my doctrine is calculated to encourage sin, and flatter immortal souls into the belief that they will be saved without holiness. Among other weapons wielded by religious combatants, I was presented with a little volume of *Essays on Christian Doctrines*, written several years since, by the now *Dr. GARDINER SPRING*, of the city of New-York. But who can imagine my surprise on meeting with the following description of a Christian Character, under the head of "*Practical Obedience!*"

"The Scriptures uniformly represent a life of practical godliness a decisive test of Christian character. A holy life is the grand mark of distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil. Let no man deceive you, he that hath righteousness is righteous; he that committeth sin is of the devil."

"There is an inseparable connexion between a holy heart and a holy life."

"Moses sinned; Samuel sinned; Paul sinned; Peter sinned; and yet they were all fervently pious. The melancholy fact is, the best of men do sin greatly. They are some times the subjects of the most awful defection."

"It is needless to conceal the truth, that the sins of good men are of an aggravated character. It is in vain to say they do not sin knowingly. They often sin with calmness and deliberation. They often commit it in defiance to the sober dictates of reason, and in defiance to the most powerful conviction of their consciences."

"It is in vain to say, they do not sin voluntarily. No man was ever constrained to sin. Sin cannot be forced upon men contrary to their own inclination. The children of God therefore do sin."

"There is no principle within the whole compass of morals, that admits of more strict demonstration than this, that there can be but two moral characters that are essentially different. It is absurd to say, he is neither a saint nor sinner; neither penitent nor impenitent. One side or the other will claim every intelligent being, in heaven, on earth, or in hell."

Indeed, said I, after selecting the above plain acknowledgments and statements, are such the men that are forming characters for eternity? Are they alarmed lest sinners should expect to be saved? Do they talk of licentious doctrine? Do but look at the above extracts; and see to what characters *Hopkinsianism* promises heaven. It is to the best of men; to those that sin greatly, often, most aggravatingly, most awfully, knowingly, calmly, deliberately, in defiance of reason, and against the convictions of

conscience. "He that committeth sin is of the devil;" and therefore, those whom the Doctor calls the best of men, are *often* children of the devil—great children of the devil—voluntarily his children, &c. and to all, such *righteous sinners*, orthodox promises life. Now can it be possible that my neighbours love my soul so well, as to want to make me such a christian? Would they have me so "servently pious," as often to become a *great, aggravating, voluntary* child of the devil?

We do very well know, Mr. Editor, that Doctor Spring's description of "Practical Obedience," as above stated, agrees well with the lives of many who profess the orthodox religion, and that it is worse than vain, to attempt to make people of common discernment believe, that they do not sin as often, and as deliberately, as people in general who profess no religion. But I do hope my religious opposers will not so underrate my understanding, as to suppose I shall be caught in a *fly-trap* of orthodox essays, in which the known character of those servently pious men, is given, who sin in the manner described. If these children of the devil are safe, let us hear no more of dangerous doctrine!

OBSERVATOR.

Note. Dr. Spring's book savours of the *beautiful consistency* of Dr. Cumming's Vade-Mecum. Dr. S. however, has established the price of heaven at "one holy desire," in his sermon on Election. "If they have one holy desire," says the Doctor, of the non-elect, "they will be saved." From what? Not from *sin*, surely; for excepting *one* holy desire, all their affections will be under the dominion and influence of sin. They will be saved from *holiness*.

ED. GOS. HER.

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

Trenton, April 29, 1824.

Br. Fitz—A. B. feels obliged to Mr. F. for his reply to a few questions proposed by him; but regrets that Mr. F. sees but on one side of the question, particularly in that important one, the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

To A. B.'s first question, whether Jesus Christ was God or man, or both? Mr. F. replies—"He was the Son of God, a man approved of God." John, in his general Epistle iii. 1. says, "Behold what manner of love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," &c. It appears that John addressed all believers in the character you have given Christ—Son, or Sons of God. Moses, St. Paul, Matthew, &c. were sons of God; and men approved of God; but did any of the above men approved of God, make the following or similar declaration, John v. 58. Jesus said unto them, "Verily, verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was I am?" Rev. xx. 13. "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last." Paul tells the Colossians, That all things were made by him and for him; also He is before all things, and by him all things consist—We think not.

To the second, Mr. F. says, "We answer in the affirmative, asserting as our opinion, that to say nothing of Idolatry, it is ignorance to worship Jesus

Christ as any being but the *Son of God*." Mr. F. will not deny, perhaps, that Jesus Christ was worshipped while in the body prepared for him, by men and women, and that in no case did he forbid them, and when that body had left our earth, by the martyr Stephen, saying, *Lord Jesus, receive my soul*. Mr. F. interrogates, "Was Paul mistaken? Should he have said the mediator is God?" and then exultingly asks—"Is not God one? Is not the mediator one? How many are twice one?" Will Mr. F.'s declaration be taken in evidence? We hope so—here it is—"I and the Father are One, not Two." See, G. H. vol. i. p. 156. We are of opinion the rule for calculating numbers has not altered since Mr. F. made the above declaration; if it has, Mr. F. should have apprised his readers. To the third question, Mr. F. says, "If there is but *one* God, as the Scriptures assert, A. B. cannot worship any God but Christ, for the plain reason that there is no other to worship." Mr. F.'s opinion shall be consulted again—page 62. vol. i. "We consider the Scriptures to be explicit in their declaration, relative to the one only true God, rending the heavens and coming down, assuming *our flesh, and nature*, and redeeming us by his blood, and cleansing us from all sin." Again, p. 71. "There is one fact speaks volumes in the favour of the divinity of Christ, and which is of itself a complete refutation of the *Unitarian* heresy which is attempted to be promulgated and proved in this city, it destroys in a moment all the quibbling of these system makers, and leaves them unsupported by every thing but their own *vanity*—namely, *I and my Father are one*. It is we think conclusive that Christ told the Jews he was greater than Solomon and before Abraham, and assumed the title and appellation, which belongs to God alone, and told the Jews if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins." "For without controversy great is the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh," &c.* Colossians ii. 9. For in him dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Mr. F. again questions—"Will you pretend that the least among Christ's brethren is Christ?" We answer in the affirmative, if Christ has no more power than a mere man, as some very wise men teach. Mr. F. says, suppose a case, "When the King of France sent his son into Spain, the Duke D'Angouleme, and gave orders that all should honour the son, the Duke, even as they honoured the father, the King, was it necessary in complying with this requisition, to assert, that the Duke and King were One?"—I will admit the Duke and King to be equal in power and honour, and then ask Mr. F. if he supposes he would show his devotion to the King and Duke, by proclaiming at all times and places that they were two unequal persons, or that the King possessed all power, and the son no more than any common person? If the kingdom would the Duke's august father take Mr. F. for a loyal subject? We think not—and that Mr. F. so far from pleasing either, might suffer in the flesh—for his temerity.

* E. P. A.'s dear little creature to the contrary notwithstanding. What next?

The King and the Duke we will leave, together with all Priests and Dictators. One more extract from the Gospel Herald, vol. i. p. 156.—Mr. F.'s reply to Sharman—The conclusion of E. S.'s communication will not stand the test, namely, I shall continue to regard them as two separate, and unequal beings, and copy after one, in adoring the other, as my only God, and as the best and most effectual means I am acquainted with to perfect my holiness, and consummate my felicity in time and to all eternity, Amen.—We think E. S. would make an excellent Jew, but will not altogether do for a Christian.—Now we have one question to ask, E. S. contends that Christ is imperfect, and unequal, &c. And he with a view to perfect his holiness, is determined to copy after this imperfect and unequal being. How long will it take E. S. to perfect his holiness, according to his premises?—Now A. B. has one question to ask—If E. S. holds the above sentiment, and is a Jew, to what sect must we place Mr. F.? Yours, A. B.

REMARKS.

The above is a reply to our answer to A. B.'s questions, in No. 50, p. 395. Passing by the first paragraph, in reply to the second, we have only to say, that our answer to the question was given in the words of inspired writers. They declared of Christ that he was "the Son of God," and "a man approved of God." It is readily admitted that Moses, Paul, and Matthew, never made the declaration of themselves, that Christ made of himself.

We would reiterate our answer to A. B.'s second question, referred to in his third paragraph, and request him to remember, that the Martyr Stephen said, he saw "the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Stephen did not see, nor say, that the Son of Man was God. But, seeing Jesus, he cried, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (Acts vii. 56-59.)

Relative to the Mediator, he is spoken of as distinct from God. Paul says, "One God, and one Mediator," &c. We now ask, "How many are twice one?" A. B. quotes from the G. H. vol. i. p. 156, "I and the Father are one; not two." He says, "the rule for calculating numbers has not altered since Mr. F. made the above declaration," &c. This is admitted. But our understanding of the passage has altered, and we have informed, and now inform our readers of it. Instead of understanding Christ to mean that he and his Father are one being or person, and that there was no God but himself, the declared Son of God, and the sent of God, we now understand Christ to signify that he and his Father were agreed, were of one mind, and had one purpose. We are constrained to this view by an attentive examination of the following passage—John xvii. 20, 21. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." The use of the word one, in this passage, unequivocally defines it to signify agreement; that those spoken of, should be of

one mind, &c. as Christ and his Father were of one mind." Will A. B. admit the inference drawn from the declaration, and allow that all believers, the Father, and the Son, are one being or person? Surely Christ is clear and explicit, when he prays that believers may "be one in us;" that is, to use his own explanation; "that they all may be one; as thou Father, in me, and I in thee." Christ has taught us, in the above quotation, in what sense he and the Father are one.

Of A. B.'s quotation from G. H. vol. i. p. 62, we say, we understand that God's Spirit, figuratively spoken of as blood, redeems man, &c. Also, "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." We have seen how the Father is in the Son; the same as believers are in the Father and Son. Thus, God may be considered as rending the heavens, as coming in his Son, and by his Spirit, operating in the great work of man's redemption.

Of A. B.'s quotation from G. H. vol. i. p. 71, we remark, that we are, in the strict sense of the term, UNITARIAN in our faith. Not Socinian! Not of the faith of those who call themselves Unitarians, who consider Jesus Christ to be a mere man in all senses, as much so as any of Adam's posterity; and profess to believe in the future great, and dreadful punishment of sinners, or, perhaps, of their endless misery, or annihilation of their being. We are not equivocal in our confession. The editor of this paper believes God, when he says, "I the Lord [Jehovah] and no god beside me. I God and none else." Isa. xlv. Therefore, we believe in one God, and only one. God teaches Unit-arianism, and men teach Trinit-arianism. We believe Christ, when he says, "I am." That is, I, self, and am existing. Because Christ declared, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." The Jews did not believe this. No mere man has "life in himself," as God has life in himself. A. B.'s quotation from 1 Tim. iii. 16, "God manifest in the flesh," &c. is a disputed passage, some Greek copies not reading God. It is declared, Heb. i. that "God hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son," &c. We, however, see no difficulty in admitting the reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16, for God was manifest or known in the flesh, by his Son, who was in the flesh. A. B.'s note, referring to E. P. A.'s communication in No. 50, p. 396, appears to be superfluous. Paul speaks of believer's being "filled with all the fulness of God;" (Ephes. iii. 19.) and who will deny that God filled his Son, or dwelt in him!

A. B.'s answer to our interrogation in his fourth paragraph, is merely an evasion of the question. His remarks on the simile we introduced to illustrate the honouring of Christ as the Son, the sent of God, do not appear to us to possess sufficient candour to entitle them to particular attention; or argument, to require a detailed reply. We are of opinion, that no man can honour the Son, unless they come unto him, and know him; and that no man can come, unless the Father, who sent the Son, draw him.

A. B.'s last paragraph contains a quotation from

G. H. vol. i. p. 156. We considered E. Sharman to speak of the Son of God as of a man, using the term *unequal* in an equivocal sense, so as to imply imperfection in Christ, whom we regard as *perfect*.

A. B.'s closing interrogation is easily answered. Namely—"If E. S. holds the above sentiments, and is a *Jew*, to what sect must we place Mr. F.?" Ans. With those who have *honesty* to avow their sentiments, and *courage* to advocate them.

PATHETIC DESCRIPTION OF SACRIFICES.

"See yonder Druid, with fierceness glaring in his eyes, and the consecrated branch in his hand, polluting thy soil, O Britain! with the ashes of hundreds of victims consumed in an enormous image! But soft—we promised to produce examples only from polished nations, and from empires at the zenith of their glory. And we shall not have read far in the pages which record the brightest splendours of antiquity, before we find the "pitiful woman," offering her first born for her "transgressions, the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul;" the mother "forgetting her suckling child," and "ceasing to have compassion upon the son of her womb." My heart fails me, and the blood curdles in my veins with horror, when I recollect that it was a custom common among the Carthaginians to sacrifice children to Saturn. The statue of that idol was of brass, and formed with extended arms; but so constructed, as to suffer whatever was placed upon them, to fall into a fierce fire; flaming in a furnace at the foot of the image. The trembling parent approached with a countenance of ease which ill concealed the anguish of the heart, and presented his child. The distracted mother imprinted, with a parched lip, a last kiss upon the blooming cheek of her smiling infant. The ferocious priest, clothed in scarlet, received the unconscious babe from the maternal embrace; and placing it on the arms of the infernal image, it fell into the fire. At that instant the drums were beat, and the air rang with acclamations from the surrounding multitude, to cover the agony of the bereaved parents, and to drown the shrieks of the consuming victim! On one occasion,* two hundred children of the first families in Carthage were thus immolated! and on their annual sacrifices, those who had no children were accustomed to purchase those of the poor for this horrible purpose."

Collyer.

SYNOD OF KENTUCKY.

The Synod, "in a narrative of the state of religion within the bounds of the synod of Kentucky," say

"The Synod have to lament that in some places *infidelity* prevails. This is particularly the case in Lexington, Frankfort, and Lancaster. It is worthy of remark, that in those places where *Universalism*, and other false views of Christianity are attempted to be taught, *there* open infidelity soon rears its head. The same remark is applicable to intemperance, profane swearing, and indeed vice of every kind. Error and crime go together."

We are of opinion that the persons who promulgated the above, if they were not idiots, knew, at the time, that they were asserting rank falsehood. We readily appeal to all the honest men of common sense in the Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed churches in this city, for evidence that the "Synod of Kentucky" have publicly asserted an untruth. As Paul said, "These things were not done in a corner." The time *was*, when Universalists were so few in number, and so little known by the professing Christian world, that *slander* would pass very current. But now, the case is altered. We can refer them to members of their *own* church, who believe in the salvation of *all* men, for evidence, that *Universalism* is not productive of "*intemperance, profane swearing, and vice of every kind.*"

The Synod also declare, that "they have likewise to lament the prevalence of lukewarmness in many of their churches, accompanied with a *sinful conformity to the world.*" If the Synod is a fair sample of the Churches, this appears reasonable; for the *world* is most shamefully given to *slander and detraction.*

MODERN RELIGIOUS REVIVALS.

An orthodox preacher named William Bently, giving an account of religious revivals which he had been instrumental in raising, says, he "inquired of a Mrs. R—, if she professed religion, or possessed it? She answered in the negative." A few days afterward he saw this lady, and says, he "found the Lord had *blessed the word* to the lady before mentioned, and that she was in *great distress* for her soul." The Scriptures inform us, that "the *blessing* of the Lord maketh *rich.*" This is surely a strange *blessing* which confers "*great distress*" on all who receive it. We hope the day is not far distant when these theological busybodies will be left to shift for themselves; so far as to seek some honest calling, and not be encouraged to disturb the peace of society with their false representations of Deity.

INTERESTING TO ALL CONCERNED.

This Number concludes the Fourth Volume of the Gospel Herald. Those indebted are once more requested to forward the sums due, without delay. All disposed to patronize the Fifth Volume, are referred to the Prospectus, No. 49, p. 392, for the Conditions; a compliance with which is indispensable, as there set forth, to the continuance of the work. Namely—Paying ONE DOLLAR IN ADVANCE! Any person who will pay one dollar in advance, shall be considered a Subscriber. The First Number of the Fifth Volume will be issued on Saturday, May 22d. All letters and communications for this Paper, must be post paid. Residence of the Editor, No. 255 Grand-street. Office, No. 67 Chrystie-street.

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound in leather backs and corners, and handsomely lettered, at three shillings per vol. by sending them to James Aymar, 27 Chrystie-street. Subscribers will please write their names on their volumes.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, AT THE OFFICE OF THE GOSPEL HERALD, NO. 67 CHRYSSTIE-STREET.

* When Agathocles was about to besiege Carthage,

Quadrations: p 2, 65, 247, 384

Grainations

Thompson, C. S. } At Pittsford, Monroe Co, N.Y.
Holladay, C. G. } Sept. 23. 1823. p 256.

Brooks John. At Barnardston, Mass. Oct
7. 1823. p 216



